



# राजपत्र, हिमाचल प्रदेश

## हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य शासन द्वारा प्रकाशित

खण्ड : 49

शिमला, शनिवार, 21 जुलाई, 2001/30 आषाढ़, 1923

संख्या : 29

### विषय सूची

भाग-1	वैधानिक नियमों को छोड़ कर हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल और हिमाचल प्रदेश हाई कोर्ट द्वारा अधिसूचनाएँ इत्यादि ..	768—792
भाग-2	वैधानिक नियमों को छोड़ कर नियमित विधायिकों के अध्यक्षों और जिला मैजिस्ट्रेटों द्वारा अधिसूचनाएँ इत्यादि ..	792—793
भाग-3	प्रधिनियम, विधेयक और विधेयकों पर प्रबंध समिति के प्रतिवेदन, वैधानिक नियम तथा हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल, हिमाचल प्रदेश हाई कोर्ट, फाईनेंशियल कमिशनर तथा कमिशनर भाक इन्हम टैक्स द्वारा अधिसूचित आदेश इत्यादि ..	793—798
भाग-4	स्थानीय स्वायत शासन, मूलिकियल बोर्ड, डिस्ट्रिक्ट बोर्ड, नोटिफिकेशन और टाइन एरिया तथा वंचायती राज विभाग ..	—
भाग-5	वैयक्तिक अधिसूचनाएँ और विज्ञापन ..	798—818
भाग-6	भारतीय राजपत्र इत्यादि में पुनः प्रकाशन ..	—
भाग-7	भारतीय निर्वाचन आयोग (Election Commission of India) को वैधानिक अधिसूचनाएँ तथा अन्य निर्वाचन सम्बन्धी अधिसूचनाएँ ..	—
—	प्रत्येक	—

21 जुलाई, 2001/30 आषाढ़, 1923 को समाप्त होने वाले सप्ताह में निम्नलिखित विज्ञितियाँ 'भ्राधारण राजपत्र, हिमाचल प्रदेश' में प्रकाशित हुई :—

विज्ञिति की संख्या	विभाग का नाम	विषय
संख्या 3-14/2000-ई० एन० एन०, दिनांक 27 जून, 2001.	निर्वाचन विभाग	राजपत्र हिमाचल प्रदेश (भ्राधारण), दिनांक 19 मार्च, 2001 में संघोषित।
No. SEC-5-17/94-II-1262-1328, dated 17th July, 2001.	State Election Commission, Himachal Pradesh	Himachal Pradesh Municipal (Disqualification of office bearers, etc.) Rules, 2001.

**भाग-1 - विधानिक निवासों को छोड़कर हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल और हिमाचल प्रदेश द्वारा अधिसूचनाएं इत्याचित्त**  
**हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार**

**प्रधानपालन विभाग**

शुभ्रि पत्र

शिमला, 30 जून, 2001

संख्या ५० इच्छा वाई-१९८० (१०)-१०/८०.—इस कार्यालय की अधिसूचना संख्या ५० इच्छा वाई-१९८० (१०)-१०/८०, वित्तीक २८-६-२००१, द्वारा क्रम संख्या-४ पर जो प्रति भूमिकेन सम्बन्धित नौ० लिंग विभाग सालान, विवासोलन को प्रदानित की गई है, के स्थान पर उच्चमध्यविधायिकारी (नामांकित), सचिव, विवासोलन पक्ष का जाए।

हस्ताक्षरित/  
मंत्र सचिव ।

गृह विभाग

अधिसूचना

शिमला-२, 28 जून, 2001

संख्या गृह (ए) नं (५)-१/०८—हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल, इस सरकार का समस्वेक्षण अधिसूचना, तारीख १०-६-१९८०, ६-३-२०००, ९-६-२०००, ८-१२-२००० तथा २९-३-२००१ के दस्त में आर नाधारण बण्ड अधिनियम, १८९७ (१८०७ का १०) को धारा-२१ के साथ पठित जब आपासा अधिनियम, १९५२ (१९५२ का ६०) का धारा-३ द्वारा प्रदत्त विवितों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उपर्युक्त निविष्ट अधिसूचना में वित्तिविष्ट रिपोर्ट को सर्वव सचिवार का प्रस्तुत करने की अवधि को छ मास तक अवधि, तारीख ३१-१२-२००१ तक या एस० एन० पी० (सिविल) संख्या ७४७/२००१ में उच्चतम न्यायालय के वित्तिविष्ट संपत्ति दिनों की अवधि के पश्चात तक, जो भी पूर्वतर हो, बढ़ाते हैं।

आदेश द्वारा,

प० के० गोस्वामी,  
मृत्यु सचिव ।

[Authoritative English text of this Department Notification No. Home (A)-D(4)-1/98, dated 28-6-2001 as required under clause (3) of Article 348 of the Constitution of India].

**HOME DEPARTMENT**

**NOTIFICATION**

Shimla-171/002, the 28th June, 2001

No. Home (A)-D (4)-1/98.—In continuation of this Government Notification of even number, dated 10-9-1999, 6-3-2000, 9-6-2000, 8-12-2000 and 29-3-2001 and in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 3 of the Commission of Inquiry Act, 1952 (Act No. LX of 1952) read with Section 21 of the General Clauses Act, 1897 (Act No. 10 of 1897), the Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to extend the period by 6 months i.e. upto 31-12-2001 or till after a fortnight of the decision of Supreme Court of India in SLP (Civil) No. 747/2001, whichever is earlier, for submission of the report, specified in the Notification referred to above to the State Govt.

By order,

A. K. GOSWAMI,  
Chief Secretary.

**IRRIGATION AND PUBLIC HEALTH  
DEPARTMENT**

**NOTIFICATIONS**

Shimla-2, the 26th June, 2001

No. IPH-A-2(B)6-4/2000.—The Governor, Himachal Pradesh, is pleased to order the cancellation of transfer of the following Assistant Engineers in Irrigation and Public Health Department, with immediate effect, in the public interest :—

Sl.	Name of AE's	From	To
-----	--------------	------	----

S/Shri :

1.	S. K. Sharma	U/T from IPH Circle, Orders Una to Sub-Division, Masiygarh.
----	--------------	-------------------------------------------------------------

2.	D. K. Chaudhary	U/T from IPH S/ Division, Hamirpur to I & IPH Circle, Nurpur.
----	-----------------	---------------------------------------------------------------

3.	B. S. Mastana	U/T from IPH S/ Division, Baldwara cancelled to Kotgarh.
----	---------------	----------------------------------------------------------

The above officers will submit their charge report of relinquishment or assumption to this department immediately.

Shimla-2, the 27th June, 2001

No. IPH-A-2(B)6-4/2000-Lact.—The Governor, Himachal Pradesh, is pleased to order the cancellation of transfer order of Shri Arun Kumar Sharma, Assistant Engineer, who is under transfer from IPH Sub-Division No. II, Mandi to IPH Sub-Division, Rohru with immediate effect, in public interest.

Shimla-2, the 29th June, 2001

No. IPH-A-2(B)6-4/2000.—The Governor, Himachal Pradesh, is pleased to order the cancellation of transfer order of Shri Hem Chand, Assistant Engineer, who is under transfer from IPH Division, Mandi to IPH Sub-Division, Chatri with immediate effect, in public interest.

Shimla-2, the 30th June, 2001

No. IPH(A)-2B(6)-1/2001.—The Governor, Himachal Pradesh, is pleased to order the cancellation of transfer of S/Shri Ashok Shreedhar and B. S. Bhatia, Executive Engineers who are under orders of transfer from IPH Division, Dalhousie to Solan and from IPH Division, Solan to IPH Division, Rampur issued vide this department notification of even number, dated 26-6-2001, with immediate effect, in the public interest.

Shimla-2, the 30th June, 2001

No. IPH-A-2(B)6-4/2000-Loose.—The Governor, Himachal Pradesh, is pleased to order the transfer adjustment of Shri Gulshan Rai, Assistant Engineer (Mech.), who is under order of transfer from IPH Sub-Division, Churat to IPH Sub-Division, Dadaribba at IPH Sub-Division, Dhalli, with immediate effect, in public interest.

Shimla-2, the 4th July, 2001

No. I.P.I-A-B(H)-4/2001.—The Governor, Himachal Pradesh, is pleased to order the transfer/adjustment of following Assistant Engineers (Civil) in Irrigation & Public Health Department, with immediate effect in public interest:—

Sl. No.	Name of A.E.	From	To
1	2	3	4
1.	Shri K. K. Sood	I/T from I.P.I. 8/Division, Badrikpur to S.N.P. Patalpur	I.P.I. 8/Division, Dharoh against vacancy.
2.	Shri V. D. Kanwar	I/T from I.P.I. 8/Division, Shillai to S.N.P. Patalpur	I.P.I. 8/Division, Chumna instead of Shri Mehar Chand, A. B.
3.	Shri Mehar Chand	I/T from I.P.I. 8/Division, Sangrhal to I.P.I. 8/Division, Chumna.	A. B. (D-H), P& T, Shimla against vacancy.
4.	Shri N. K. Sharma	I/T to 8/Division, Kurnarsain.	I.P.I. 8/Division No. 1, Una vice Shri N. K. Minhas.
5.	Shri S. P. Mishra	I.P.I. 8/Division-1, Una	I.P.I. 8/Division, Masti-garh under I.P.I. Division Chuglara against vacancy.

The above officers will submit their charge report of relinquishment and assumption to this department immediately.

By order,

Sd/-  
Financial Commissioner-cum-Secretary.

विधि विभाग

विभागिता

शिमला-2, 20 जून 2001

मध्या पूर्वोत्तर भारतीय क्रिश्चियत (विवाह अधिनियम, 1872 (1872 का 15) की धारा 6 और 8 के अधीन उसमें निहित विकल्पों का प्रयोग करते हुए, पास्टर (रेव) खोला दत्त, न्यू लार्क फैलार्गत, कर्सोग, जिला मार्गी का कर्सोग चैर्च, जिला मार्गी हिमाचल प्रदेश के भौतिक क्रिश्चियतों के बीच विवाह अनुस्थापित करने की अनुमति प्रदान करते हैं।

वारें दारा,

गोपनीय दारा,  
विधि प्रशासनी एवं विविध (विधि)।

[Authoritative English text of this Department notification No. L.R.-B (14)-6/2000, dated 29th June, 2001 as required under clause (3) of the Constitution of India].

## LAW DEPARTMENT

## NOTIFICATION

Shimla-171/002, the 29th June, 2001

No. L.R.-B (14)-6/2000.—In exercise of powers vested in him under Sections 6 and 9 of the Indian Christian Marriage Act, 1872 (Act No. 15 of 1872), the Governor, Himachal Pradesh, is pleased to grant a licence to solemnize marriages among the Christians within the territory of Karol Church, District Mandi

(I.P.) to Pastor (Rev) Khola Dutt, New Life Fellowship, Karol, District Mandi.

By order,

RAMDESHWAR SHARMA,  
I. R-cum-Secretary (Law).

## LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT DEPARTMENT

## NOTIFICATION

Shimla-2, the 26th May, 2001

No. 19-B/97-Shram-II. In exercise of the powers vested in him under section 17(1) of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh, is pleased to order the publication of awards in the Rajpatha announced by the Presiding Officer, Labour Court of the following cases:

Sl. No.	Ref. No.	Particulars	Section	Remarks
1	2	3	4	
1.	Ref. No. 80/96-Shri Khem Raj Vs. Ram Mandir Nood Dharamshala, Ram Bazar Shimla & Others.	-10-		Publication
2.	Ref. No. 138/96-Didar Singh Vs. Himalaya Construction Company & Others.	-10-		-do-
3.	Ref. No. 28/99-Shri Balyant Kumar Vs. M/s. Gabriel India Parwanoo.	-10-		-do-
4.	Ref. No. 59/2000-Workers Union Vs. Mgt. of Unit & Others.	-10-		-do-

1	2	3	4	
5.	Ref. No. 213/98-Om Parkash & Others Vs. M. D. Himachal Worest, Mills Nalagarh.	-10-	Publication	Ref. Case No. 80/
6.	Ref. No. 163/98-Banware Lal Vs. M/s Drish Shoes Ltd., Tehsil Nalagarh, District Solan.	-10-	-do-	Iare:
7.	Ref. No. 167/98-Shri Anand Kumar Vs. Drish Shoes Ltd., Tehsil Nalagarh, District Solan.	-10-	-do-	1. Sh. Khem Raj Verma son of Sh. Sunder L Verma, Counter Clerk, Village Ghandal, P. Shakrah, Tehsil & District Shimla.
8.	Ref. No. 168/98-Shri Jai Ram Vs. Drish Shoes Ltd., Tehsil Nalagarh, District Solan.	-10-	-do-	2. Sh. Sohan Lal son of Sh. Molak Ram, Village Mahu Nagm, Tehsil Karsog, District Manali (H.P.).
9.	Ref. No. 160/97-Smt. Kalawati Devi Vs. Resident Engg. Shanan Power House J/Nagar, District Mandi.	-10-	-do-	3. Sh. Ram Krishan son of Sh. Dhani Ram Sharma Booking Assistant, Village Odri, P.O. Bandhu Tehsil Palampur, District Kangra (H.P.).
10.	Ref. No. 93/99-Surinder Kumar Vs. M/s Samtal India, Sector-2, Parwanoo.	-10-	-do-	4. Sh. Jai Chand son of Sh. Dev Raj, Bookin Assistant, V.P.O. Sundhagal, Tehsil Nadaur District Hamirpur (H.P.).
11.	Ref. No. 7/99-Lekh Ram Vs. the Director of Fisheries, Government of Himachal Pradesh, Bilaspur & Others.	-10-	-do-	5. Sh. Gopal Krishan son of Sh. Bhagat Ram Booking Assistant Foreign Office Cottage Dogra Lodge, Tuttikandi, Shimla.
12.	Ref. No. 12/99-Shri Sukh Ram Vs. H. P. P. W. D. Division No. 1, Bilaspur.	-10-	-do-	6. Sh. Joginder Singh son of Sh. Udhram Singh, Store Keeper, Village Kaneri, P.O. Marothi, Tehsil Karsog, District Mandi (H.P.).
13.	Ref. No. 170/99-Shri Govind Ram Vs. the Resident Engg, Bassi Power House, H. P. S. E. B. J/ Nagar, Mandi.	-10-	-do-	7. Sh. Piar Singh son of Sh. Saran Dass, Village Dodra Kwar, P.O. Kwar, Tehsil Kawaar, District Shimla.
14.	Ref. No. 62/97-Pawan Kumar Vs. M. D. State Industrial Development Corpn. Himachal Pradesh, Shimla.	-10-	-do-	8. Sh. Hari Mal Thakur son of Sh. Dumnu Ram, Village Berdna, P.O. Dharampur, Tehsil Sarkaghat, District Mandi (H.P.).
15.	Ref. No. 198/98-Shri Dole Ram Vs. I&PH, S/Nagar District Mandi (Himachal Pradesh).	-10-	-do-	9. Sh. Desh Raj son of Sh. Budhi Ram, Village Jabal-Jhabrot, P.O. Jhabal-Jhabrot, Tehsil Arki, District Solan (H.P.).
16.	Ref. No. 64/91-Shri Kapil Dev Vs. Himachal Pradesh Small Industrial and Export Corpn. Himachal Pradesh & Others.	-10-	-do-	10. Sh. Tek Singh Kanwar son of Sh. Lachhami Singh, Typist-cum-Clerk, Village Dhar, P.O. Sarkaghat Tehsil & District Shimla (H.P.).
17.	Ref. No. 30/96-Shri Bhag Singh Vs. Bharat Petro- foram Company Pvt. Ltd., Barotiwala, Solan.	-10-	-do-	11. Sh. Neki Ram son of Sh. Kakshmi Dass, Peon, Village Chickanara, P.O. Dumehar, Tehsil Arki, District Solan (H.P.).
18.	Ref. No. 41/99-Shri Roshan Lal Vs. Executive Engineer Parwati Invest Division No.-II H.P.S.E.B. Sarabai Bhunter, Kullu, Himachal Pradesh.	-10-	-do-	12. Sh. Sher Singh son of Sh. Lakha Ram, Village Thara, P.O. Thara, Tehsil Baijnath, District Kangra (H.P.). Petitioners.
19.	Ref. No. 22/99-Shri Nanda Ram Vs. The Conservator of Forest, Nahan Circle, Nahan, District Sirmaur, Himachal Pradesh & Others.	-10-	-do-	1. Ram Mandir Sood Dharamshala, Ram Bazar, Shimla through its Manager.
20.	Ref. No. 91/97-Shri Dharminder Singh Vs. M/s B. C. C. Fuba Ltd., Nalagarh, Tehsil Nanagarh, District Solan.	-10-	-do-	2. Sood Sabha, Ram Mandir Complex, Ram Bazar, Shimla through its Secretary ..Respondents.
21.	Ref. No. 203/98-Anant Ram Vs. Hotz Industry Pvt. Ltd., Prop of Alasia Hotel, Kasauli, District Solan.	-10-	-do-	Reference under section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.
22.	Ref. No. 141/99-Shri Vijay Rattan Vs. Saysons Pvt. Laboratories Ltd., Parwanoo.	-10-	-do-	For Petitioners : Sh. Hem Raj, AR.
23.	Ref. No. 48/95-Rajinder Singh Driver Vs. C. F. J. V. H/O Sholding, Bhawa Nagar, District Kinnar.	-10-	-do-	For Respondents: Sh. R. L. Kaith, Advocate.

By order,

Sd/-

Fin. Commr.-Cum-Secretary.

This reference has been received from the appropriate Government. The reference has been sent for adjudication of the claim of 13 workers serving in Ram Mandir Sood Dharamshala, Shimla with regard to their alleged illegal termination in violation of Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the claim petition has been signed only by five persons namely S/Shri Khem Raj petitioner No. 1, Pyar Singh Petitioner No. 7, Tek Singh Petitioner No. 10 two others, whose names are not legible. It has been alleged that petitioners were inducted in employment on different dates and their

services except for petitioner No. 6 were terminated illegally on 10-6-1996. It is submitted that they had completed more than 240 days in a calendar year before their illegal termination. Further that neither any enquiry was conducted nor any retrenchment compensation etc., was paid to them.

2. Petitioners have also alleged that the respondents are owning and managing Ram Mandir Complex situated at Ram Bazar, Shimla. Certain premises of the complex have been rented out and other parts of the complex comprising of two big halls and more than 100 rooms are being rented for marriage ceremonies and other social functions on payment of charges. About 20 workers have been employed by the respondent, but they are not being paid minimum wages as per the Labour Laws. Therefore, to protect the interest of workers, a union was formed on 18-1-1996 in the name of Ram Mandir Sood Dharamshala Workers Union. Intimation in this regard was duly sent to the Management and grievances were put forth by the workers through their union. Since the demands were not met, a strike notice was served on 2-2-1996. It is also contended that petitioners were to resort to token strike on 16-2-1996, but the management communicated with them *vide* their letter dated 12-2-1996 and supplied a duty roaster by way of punishment for raising the voice against the management. It is further submitted that though this letter was duly replied, but in order to scuttle the legitimate rights of the workers, management with malafide intentions transferred petitioner No. 1 from Shimla to Haridwar. It is submitted that this action was taken to victimize the workers for being the office bearers of the union. A representation was made by the employee through the union in this regard as well, however to no avail. Then Labour Inspector-cum-Conciliation Officer was approached. On receiving the communication from Labour Inspector, respondent instead of settling the dispute, prevented the petitioners from marking their presence and did not allow them to perform their duties. Again a letter was sent by the workers on 24-8-96 and a complaint was also made to the Labour Officer.

3. It is alleged that respondents then framed false charges against petitioner No. 1 and also sacked petitioner No. 6 from service. Efforts of the Conciliation Officer to settle the matter failed due to non-conciliatory attitude of the management. Hence, the matter was referred to this Court by the appropriate Government.

4. The different dates of the appointment of the petitioners have been detailed in Para-12 of the claim petition.

5. In the reply filed by the management preliminary objections have been raised that only four persons have signed the claim petition and even the names of the persons signing it are not clearly spelt. It is also contended that the reference is bad in law and it is without jurisdiction. Further that the respondent is not an industry as defined under the Industrial Disputes Act. Therefore, no reference could have been sent under section 10 (1) of the Act.

6. On the merits it is contended that the respondent is a charitable and religious institution and only maintenance charges are being charged from the visitors staying in Dharamshala. It is also contended that some portion of the building has been rented out to meet the expenses of the charitable works being undertaken by the Sabha. It is also mentioned that the income thus generated is not even sufficient or the activities of the Sabha and it has to depend upon the help of philanthropists and donors. The respondent has emphasized that no business is being run by the Sabha rather, Dharamshala is being used as a Charitable institution.

7. The respondents has also mentioned that all the employees are getting reasonable pay and the Labour Laws are not applicable. It is also contended that on the instigation of the 'Lal Jhanda' Union some of the employees got misguided and proceeded on strike *w.e.f.* 11-5-96. It is also submitted that transfer of petitioner

No. 1 from Shimla to Hardwar had nothing to do with trade union activities and he was only transferred in the larger interests of the Sabha. Similarly it is mentioned that petitioner No. 6 was on probation and his performance was not found satisfactory. Hence his services were terminated.

8. The respondents have also alleged that no employee was disengaged or terminated nor any disciplinary action was taken against them. Rather the union resorted to illegal strike *w.e.f.* 11-5-96 and indulged in demonstrations outside the main gate of Ram Mandir Dharamshala. Therefore stay order had to be obtained from the civil court against the petitioner who are restraining the worshipper and other workers from entering the Dharamshala premises. It is submitted that out of the petitioners, petitioner No. 3 Ram Krishan, petitioner No. 4, Jai Chand, petitioner No. 5 Gopal Krishan, petitioner No. 8 Hari Mal Thakur, petitioner No. 10 Tek Singh, petitioner No. 11 Amar Nath and petitioner No. 13 Sher Singh have no dispute and have joined the services of the respondent and the claim of the rest of the petitioners is not genuine. Hence reference may be answered against them.

9. On the pleadings of the parties, my ld. predecessor had framed the following issues on 30-8-1996 :-

1. Whether the termination of the services of the petitioners is illegal and contrary to the provisions of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 as alleged ?

OPP

2. Whether the petition in its present form is not maintainable on the grounds as alleged ?

OPR

3. Whether this Court has no jurisdiction to entertain, try and adjudicate upon the reference in question as alleged ?

OPR

4. Whether the respondent does not fall within the definition of an industry as defined in section 2 (j) of the Act as alleged ?

OPR

5. Relief

OPR

#### Issues : 2; 3 and 4 FINDINGS

10. All these issues are being taken up jointly as they require the appreciation of same evidence and law. The main contention of the respondent is that it is not an industry under the Industrial Disputes Act and therefore, matter could not have been referred by the state Government for adjudication. Secondly that since the Industrial Disputes Act is not applicable therefore, there is no question of adation of section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The contention of the respondent is that though Sood Sabha Complex has been partially rented out to a Bank and for shops, and also that though the rooms in the Dharamshala run by the respondent are being let out to the visitors, but only use and occupation charges are being taken in order to maintain the charitable activities of the Sabha. It is emphasized that no commercial activities are taking place and rent being charged is for maintenance on no profit basis. Therefore, the respondent is not an industry. Hence the Industrial Disputes Act is not applicable.

11. On the other hand, the petitioners have contended that huge amount of income is being generated by renting out the shops and premises to a commercial Bank and also two big halls are being given on rent for marriages and other social functions. The rooms are also being rented as a consequence of commercial activities, therefore, the respondent is indulging in commercial activities and is an industry. It is also emphasized that all these activities are being undertaken in an organized manner. Therefore the respondent cannot take the plea that it is not an industry.

12. The evidence which has come on record consists of statement of three of the petitioners namely Khem Raj, Sohan Lal and Neki Ram and three witnesses on behalf

of the respondent namely Shri Om Parkash, Vijay Kumar Sood and Shri Jaswant Rai. Shri Khem Raj, Sohan Lal and Neki Ram have stated that there are about 100 rooms, which are rented out to the public. In addition, the halls are rented out for the marriage and other social functions and also some shops have been rented out permanently. It is also submitted that there is a canteen, also which has been given on contract basis and is also generating income.

13. On the other hand, Shri Vijay Kumar Sood who is the treasurer of the Respondent Sabha has mentioned that income is being generated by donations, revenue generated through Dharamshala and rent from the commercial shop etc. and also the use and maintenance charges from the rooms of Dharamshala. However, they are running two Sood Dharamshalas one at Shimla and the other at Haridwar and also a Ram Temple at Shimla. Respondent is also running a free homoeopathy Dispensary at Shimla and providing scholarships to poor children, unemployed persons and is taking other charitable activities. It is also mentioned that they are exempt from income tax being charitable institution. He has mentioned that no commercial business activities are being taken up. In cross-examination, he has been given suggestion that annual turn over of the business of Dharamshala is about one crore, which is denied. However, he has mentioned that he has not brought the balance sheet for any year. Shri Jaswant Rai, who is the President of Ram Mandir Sood Dharamshala has mentioned that it is an institution for poor, widows and the students.

14. The respondents have also relied upon a judgment delivered by Hon'ble Court of Gujarat reported in 1992-FLR-808, wherein it was held that where activities of Dharama, Dhyan, Bhakti and Pooja are carried and when nothing is shown to prove that prasad etc., are at a profit, then temple cannot be considered to be an industry.

15. On the other hand petitioners have relied upon the judgment delivered by Hon'ble H.P. High Court, in CWP No. 330 of 1998 dated 1-9-98 wherein this point was considered *viz-a-viz* the status of Bawa Balak Nath Temple Trust Deothsid. In this detailed judgment interpretation of Section 2 (j) of the Industrial Disputes Act has been given with reference to the judgment delivered by Hon'ble the Supreme Court in Bangalore Water Supply Versus A. Rajappa and others reported in (1978) 2-SCC-213. The Hon'ble the Supreme Court has laid down certain tests for deciding whether an establishment is an industry or not. It is held that industry as defined under Section 2 (j) of the Industrial Disputes Act and explained in Banerji (*supra*), has a wide import.

16. (a) Where (i) systematic activity, (ii) organized by co-operation between employer and employee (the direct and substantial element is commercial) (iii) for the production and/or distribution of goods and services calculated to satisfy human wants and wishes (not spiritual or religious but inclusive of material things or services geared to celestial bliss e.g. making, on a large scale prasad or food), *prima facie*, there is an 'industry' in that enterprise. (b) Absence of profit motive or gainful objective is irrelevant, be the venture in the public, joint private or other sector.

17. (c) The true focus is functional and the decisive test is the nature of the activity with special emphasis on the employer-employee relations. (d) If the organization is a trade or business it does not cease to be one because of philanthropy animating the undertaking."

18. Our own Hon'ble High Court of Himachal Pradesh has held in CWP No. 330 of 1998 that the tests laid down in Para 140 of Bangalore Water Supply (*supre*) prove that Baba Balak Nath trust is an industry. It was held that ;—

"that the trust is an 'industry' being undertaking, which is engaged in (i) systematic activity, (ii)

organized by co-operation between employer and its employees (iii) for the production and/or distribution of goods and services calculated to satisfy human wants and wishes of devotees and pilgrims visiting the temple of the Trust by carrying on the activities of construction, development and maintenance of the buildings and properties of the Trust including that of the Temple and 'Thadas' where the offerings are made, running of langar for the devotees and pilgrims, the running of canteen, maintenance of mini museum, library, school, colleges etc. etc. as stated in the reply affidavit of the Trust. It is of no consequence that langar is being run free of any charge and canteen is being run on no profit no loss basis as absence of profit motives or gainful objectives in the activities of the undertaking is irrelevant. The true focus is functional and decisive test is nature of the activity with the special emphasis on the employer-employee relations having semblance to trade or business, which test is satisfied by the facts brought on record by the Trust to hold it 'industry' as defined in section 2 (j) of the Act."

19. The Hon'ble High Court has observed that by applying these dominant nature tests as held in Bangalore Water Supply *Supra*, Baba Balak Nath Trust is an industry. It was observed that "it is not the case of the trust that the petitioners were engaged for such activities which are purely spiritual or religious for which it must be having regular staff. Therefore, in answer to the first question we hold that the trust is an 'industry' and the petitioners being its daily waged workers are its workmen, who are governed by the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act."

20. In the present case the petitioners are engaged in the activity which can not be termed as spiritual and religious. They are employed in a organised systematic activity of running Dharamshala. May be that Dharamshala is running its business *i.e.* renting out of rooms of Dharamshala, renting out of halls for marriages and social functions and renting out of certain shops and commercial premises for the bank on no profit basis allegedly, yet these activities are akin to the activities of an industry. It is of no consequence that activities are being undertaken on no profit no loss basis as these considerations have been held to be irrelevant by Hon'ble the Apex Court and it is emphasized that true focus is functional and decisive test is nature of the activity with the special emphasis on the employer-employee relations having semblance to trade and business. Moreover though it is alleged that these premises are being rented out on no profit no loss basis or as maintenance charges for use and occupation, but the accounts books which could determine the exact nature of work and business have not been produced in the Court. Suggestion has been given by the petitioners that turn over of the Dharamshala is about one crore which is denied. But it is admitted that about 40,000/- per month is being generated as income from the rental and annual income of the trust is about 6 to 7 lacs. Further that about 16 workers are working regularly for the Dharamshala, so all these activities establishes that the respondent is an industry for the purpose of relationship between it and its employees and therefore, Industrial Disputes Act is applicable to it. I, therefore hold that respondent is an industry within the meaning of section 2 (j) of the Industrial Disputes Act and the reference does not suffer from any such defect and it is maintainable and this Court has jurisdiction to determine the dispute in question.

21. As regard the arguments that only five persons have signed the claim petition, there seems to be merit in this objection. Petitioners Khem Raj, Tek Singh, Sohan Lal have appeared in the witness box in support of their claim and so it appeared that they are the signatories of the claim petition though I may add that neither in the examination-in-chief nor in the cross-examination, they have been confronted with these signatures in the claim petition. I, therefore, hold that claim petition has been signed only by petitioners, Khem Raj, Sohan Lal.

Pyar Singh, Tek Singh and Neki Ram, and is maintainable on their behalf only. Therefore, the issues are decided accordingly.

20. *Issue No. 1.*—Petitioners have claimed that their terminations is illegal as the compliance of section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act has not been made. Specific reference which has been made to this Court is with regard to non-compliance of section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. Though the claim of the petitioners is that their termination is punitive in nature as they had formed a union and raised some demands for minimum wages etc., but the management has disputed this claim by saying that it was the workers who resorted to illegal strike and their services infact were not terminated by the respondent. In order to apprieciate the rival contentions it will be proper to go through the genesis of the dispute.

21. Some of the petitioners who have filed claim petition have been serving the respondents for 4-5 years, but they chose to form a union only in January, 1996. Petitioner No. 1 Shri Khem Raj, was the General Secretary of the union. According to him the workers raised the demands for minimum wages and for providing roster for the workmen working for 8 hrs. a day but the management in order to punish the workers, though did formulate a roster, but it was done in such a way that workers were put to inconvenience. The workers communicated with management through a letter pointing out that the roster is not in accordance with law, as it provides for (a) 8 hrs. continuous duty, (b) no indication regarding the change of roster for those who were working in the night shift (c) does not make any mention of holidays and leaves etc. The roster circulated by the management on record and the document shows that the objections raised by the union in this behalf were not without substance. It seems that thereafter further correspondence took place between the workers and the management and workers served a notice to proceed on strike. In the meantime the petitioner No. 1 was transferred from Shimla to Haridwar and was directed to join there within 4 days. This fact further aggravated the matter. Moreover petitioner No. 6 who had joined recently and was allegedly on probation was terminated *vide* a written communication alleging that his work is not satisfactory. In these circumstances the differences between the workers and the management depened according to the workmen they were not allowed to mark their presence though they had approached the Conciliation Officer and had also tried to negotiate with the management through his good offices.

22. On the other hand the contention of the management is that the workers indulged in slogan shouting and did not report for duty and thereafter, they had to obtain a stay against them from the civil court to get free access to Sood Sabha Dharamshala.

23. The fact remain that these workers accept petitioner No. 6 completed more than 240 days. It can not also lost sight of that the differences between the workers and the management arose after the formation of the union and raising of the demands for minimum wages and duty roster. It was has not been disputed that the petitioner No. 1 was the General Secretary of the union and he was transferred from Shimla to Haridwar. The management has not led any evidence to show that in the past also the employees from one concern were being shifted to another in the interest and in the case of normal functioning of the Sood Sabha. So it appears that it was a coercive step taken by the management to curb the union activities. It is apparent from the evidence and the documents that management did not respond positively to the efforts made by the Conciliation Officer to settle the dispute. There is also nothing on record to show that the worker had abstained from work continuously despite management being willing to allow them to work pending their grievances. Though it has been stated that the work of Sabha came to standstill for a long period ranging from 2 to 4 months but there is no evidence to prove that the workers were on strike and were not attending to their duties. Moreover had the workers been absenting themselves the management was at liberty to proceed

against them by taking disciplinary action for their misconduct. Admittedly no enquiry was held against them. Moreover even the retrenchment compensation etc., was not admittedly paid. It seems that though no oral or written order of retrenchment was passed by the management, but the management did not allow the petitioners to join duties, which amounts to retrenchment of the workers. Admittedly none of the conditions under section 25-F of the Act were adhered to. Therefore, the disengagement of the workers amounts to retrenchment in violation of Section 25-F of the Act. Since only 5 of the petitioners have signed the claim petition and have authorised Shri Hem Raj to espouse their claim, therefore, the reference succeed with respect to these five persons. Even otherwise the respondents have mentioned in their reply that eight persons have joined back and are still in the employment of Sood Sabha. Therefore, the claim with respect to only Khem Raj, Sohan Lal, Tek Singh, Pyar Singh and Neki Ram survive.

24. As regards petitioner Joginder Singh, admittedly he has not completed 240 days, therefore, he was not entitled to any compensation or notice. Moreover, his disengagement is not stigmatic and he has been disengaged having not satisfactorily worked during the probation period. Hence the issues are decided accordingly.

#### RELIEF

25. Keeping in view the aforesaid discussion and findings I hold that the disengagement of the petitioners namely Khem Raj, Sohan Lal, Tek Singh, Pyar Singh and Neki Ram amounts to retrenchment and is illegal being violative of Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. I, therefore hold that they are entitled to reinstatement with full back seniority and are also entitled to 50% of backwages from the date of their disengagement till they are re-instated or within 40 days of the publication of the award whichever is earlier. It is stated that 50% of the wages have already been paid *vide* interim order passed by this Court till February, 2001. The interim order stands vacated. No Reference is answered accordingly. Let a copy of this award be sent for publication.

Announced in the Open Court today this 30th Day of March, 2001.

Seal.

ARUNA KAPOOR,  
Presiding Judge,  
H. P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court,  
Shimla.

In the Court of Smt. Aruna Kapoor, Presiding Judge, Himachal Pradesh Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Shimla

R 138/96

Shri Didnr Singh & others

Vs.

Himalayan Construction Company & Others

24-4-2001 :—Present.—None for the petitioners.  
Shri S. S. Desta, Advocate for Respondent.

The case called thrice, waited for quite some time. Still none appeared for the petitioner. It seems that either the petitioner has settled the matter or is not interested to pursue his case. Hence, the reference is answered in negative for want of non prosecution. Let a copy of this order be sent for publication.

Seal.

ARUNA KAPOOR,  
Presiding Judge,  
H. P Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court,  
Shimla.

In the Court of Smt. Aruna Kapoor, Presiding Judge,  
Himachal Pradesh Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour  
Court, Shimla

Ref. 28/99

Decided on 19-4-2001

Shri Balwant Kumar V/s M/s Gabriel India Ltd.,  
Parwanoo.

Present:—Shri Anil Chawla Advocate for petitioner.  
Shri V. K. Gupta, A. R. for Respondent.

As per statement of the learned counsel for the petitioner placed on record, it is stated that the petitioner is not traceable despite best efforts. He might have settled the dispute with the respondent and do not want to pursue the matter.

As per the statement made by the A.R for the respondent. The petitioner has settled the matter with the respondent *vide* Ex SI placed on record. In view of the statements of the parties placed on record. The reference is answered in negative. Let a copy of this order be sent to appropriate government for its publication.

Seal.

ARUNA KAPOOR,

Presiding Judge,

H. P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court,  
Shimla.

In the Court of Smt. Aruna Kapoor, Presiding Judge,  
Himachal Pradesh Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour  
Court, Shimla

Ref. : 59/2000

Workers Union of M/s Chhabra Tube Product Ltd.,  
B/wala .. Petitioner.

V/s

Mgt. of unit & others .. Respondent.

Reference under section 10 of the Industrial Disputes  
Act, 1947.

16-4-2001 : Present :—None for the petitioner.  
Shri V. K. Gupta A. R. for the respondent.

The case called thrice waited for quite some time. Petitioner not present despite service through Registered A. D. receipt. It is not possible to answer the reference in the absence of petitioner. Hence the reference is answered in negative for non prosecution. Let a copy of this order be sent to appropriate Government for its publication.

Seal.

ARUNA KAPOOR,

Presiding Judge,

H. P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court,  
Shimla.

In the Court of Smt. Aruna Kapoor, Presiding Judge,  
Himachal Pradesh Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour  
Court, Shimla

Ref. 213/98

Decided on 19-4-2001

Om Parkash & others .. Petitioner.

V/s

Managing Director, Himachal Worsted Mills,  
Nalagarh .. Respondent.

Reference under section 10 of the Industrial Disputes  
Act, 1947.

19-4-2001 : Present :—None for the petitioner.

Shri Rajeev Malhotra, A. R. for the respondent.

The case called thrice. Waited for quite some time. Still none appeared for the petitioner. The reference is answered in negative for want of petitioner. Hence the

petition is dismissed in default of the non-prosecution. Let a copy of this order be sent to appropriate Government for its publication.

Seal.

ARUNA KAPOOR,

Presiding Judge,

H. P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court,  
Shimla.

In the Court of Smt. Aruna Kapoor, Presiding Judge,  
Himachal Pradesh Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour  
Court Shimla

Ref. 163/98

1. Shri Banwari Lal, 2. Shri Anand Kumar, 3. Shri  
Jai Ram .. Petitioners.

V/s

M/s Drish Shoes Ltd, Tehsil Nalagarh, District Solan  
.. Respondent.

Reference under section 10 of the Industrial Disputes  
Act, 1947.

21-3-2001 : Present :—Shri J. C. Bhardwaj A. R. for the  
petitioner.

Shri Gurdeep Singh A. R. for  
the respondent.

Both the parties have settled their claim out of Court  
as per settlement Ex. P. A. and as per statements of the  
parties, they do not want to pursue this claim.

Therefore, in view of the Statements of the parties  
and settlement Ex. P. A. placed on record, the present  
petition is dismissed as having been fully satisfied and the  
reference is answered accordingly. Settlement Ex. P. A.  
will form the part of award. Let a copy of this order be  
sent to the appropriate Government for its publication.

Seal.

ARUNA KAPOOR,

Presiding Judge,

H. P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court,  
Shimla.

In the Court of Smt. Aruna Kapoor, Presiding Judge,  
Himachal Pradesh Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour  
Court, Shimla

Ref. 167/98

1. Shri Banwari Lal, 2. Shri Anand Kumar, 3. Shri  
Jai Ram .. Petitioners.

V/s

M/s Drish Shoes Ltd, Tehsil Nalagarh, District Solan  
.. Respondent.

Reference under section 10 of the Industrial Disputes  
Act, 1947.

21-3-2001 : Present :—Shri J. C. Bhardwaj A. R. for the  
petitioner.

Shri Gurdeep Singh A. R. for the  
respondent.

Both the parties have settled the claim out of Court  
as per settlement Ex P. A. and as per statements of the  
parties, they do not want to pursue this claim.

Therefore, in view of the statements of the parties and  
settlement Ex. P. A. placed on record, the present peti-  
tioner is dismissed as having been fully satisfied and the  
reference is answered accordingly. Settlement Ex. P. A.  
will form the part of award. Let a copy of this order be  
sent to the appropriate Government for its publication.

Seal.

ARUNA KAPOOR,

Presiding Judge,

H. P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court,  
Shimla.

In the Court of Smt. Aruna Kapoor, Presiding Judge,  
H. P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Shimla

Ref. 168/98

1. Shri Banwari Lal, 2. Shri Anand Kumar,  
Shri Jai Ram ..Petitioners,  
Versus

M/s Drish Shoes Ltd., Tehsil Nalagarh, District  
Solan ..Respondent.

Reference under section 10 of the Industrial Dispute  
Act, 1947.

21-3-2001 : Present : Shri J. C. Bhardwaj A. R. for  
the Petitioner.  
Shri Gurdeep Singh A. R. for  
the respondent.

Both the parties have settled their claim out of  
Court as per settlement Ex. P A and as per state-  
ments of the parties, they do not want to pursue this  
claim.

Therefore, in view of the statements of the parties  
and settlement Ex. P A placed on record, the present  
petitioner is dismissed as having been fully satisfied  
and the reference is answered accordingly. Settlement  
Ex. P A will form the part of award. Let a copy of  
his order be sent to the appropriate government for  
its publication.

Seal. ARUNA KAPOOR,  
Presiding Judge,  
H. P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court,  
Shimla.

In the Court of Smt. Aruna Kapoor, Presiding Judge,  
H. P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Shimla

Ref. No. 160/97

Decided on 23-4-2001

Smt. Kalavati Devi ..Petitioner.  
V/s ..Respondent.

Resident Engineer, Shanan Power House, Joginder  
Nagar, District Mandi ..Respondent.

Reference under section 10 of the Industrial Dispute  
Act, 1947.

23-4-2001 : Present :—Petitioner in person.

Shri Shamsher Singh, A. R. for the respondent.

In view of the statement of the petitioner, she do not  
want to pursue this petition on technical grounds with  
liberty to raise industrial dispute. So in view of the  
aforementioned the reference is answered in negative. Let  
copy of this order be sent to appropriate Government  
for its publication.

Seal. ARUNA KAPOOR,  
Presiding Judge,  
H. P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court,  
Shimla.

In the Court of Smt. Aruna Kapoor, Presiding Judge  
Himachal Pradesh Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court,  
Shimla

Ref. 93/99

Decided on 28-2-2001

Shri Surender Kumar ..Petitioner.  
V/s ..Respondent.

M/s Samtal India Ltd., Sector-2, Parwanoo  
..Respondent.

Reference under section 10 of the Industrial Dispute  
Act, 1947.

28-2-2001 : Present : None for the petitioner

Shri S. D. Gill, Advocate for the respondent

The reference has been received from the appropriate  
Government and notices were sent to the parties.  
Respondent appeared in the court. But repeated notices  
petitioner is not traceable. In the absence of petitioner  
& evidence the reference cannot be answered. Hence  
the reference is answered in negative. Let a copy of the  
order be sent to appropriate Government.

ARUNA KAPOOR,  
Presiding Judge,  
Himachal Pradesh Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour  
Court, Shimla.

In the Court of Smt. Aruna Kapoor, Presiding Judge,  
Himachal Pradesh Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court  
Shimla

Case Ref. No. 7/99

Instituted on 20-1-1999

Decided on 22-02-2001

In re :

Lekh Ram son of Shri Ghungar Ram through Shri  
J. C. Bhardwaj, General Secretary, Himachal Pradesh  
AITUC, Sapron-173211, District Solan, Himachal  
Pradesh ..Petitioner.

Versus

1. The Director of Fisheries, Government of  
Himachal Pradesh, Bilaspur, Himachal Pradesh.
2. The Assistant Director, Department of  
Fisheries, Mandi, District Mandi, Himachal  
Pradesh. ..Respondents.

Claim petition under section 10 of the Industrial Dis-  
putes Act, 1947.

#### AWARD

For petitioner : Shri J. C. Bhardwaj, AR for  
petitioner.

For respondent : Shri N. S. Chaudhary, AR for  
respondents.

Petitioner has filed the claim for reinstatement in pur-  
suance of the reference with full back wages and seniority.  
It is alleged that he worked for 10 years continuously till  
30-8-1989 in the department of fisheries Himachal  
Pradesh at Bilaspur. Thereafter, his services were  
terminated without any notice and retrenchment com-  
pensation. He has also maintained that he was never  
served with any charge sheet, show cause notice etc. and  
so his termination is illegal and he is entitled to be  
reinstated.

2. He has also mentioned that he made representa-  
tions to the department, but to no avail. Further that  
Junior persons have been retained. Therefore, he is  
reinstated with full seniority and back wages.

3. In the reply filed by the respondent it is mentioned  
that petitioner was employed as beldar though no  
formal letter of appointment was issued to him. It is  
also contended that he was not in continuous employ-  
ment rather was engaged as and when need for engag-  
ing persons on casual basis arose.

4. It is submitted that actual work day chart which  
is annexure-1 also reflects the frequent breaks availed  
by the petitioner. Respondent has further submitted  
that as per the directions of the state Government dated  
10-5-1988 the powers of the Head of Departments to  
engage class-IV employees on daily wages up to three  
months were withdrawn and therefore, petitioner  
could not be re-engaged thereafter. Hence there is no  
violation of any legal right of the petitioner. Petition  
deserves to be dismissed.

5. On the pleadings of the parties, my Ltd.  
predecessor framed the following issues on 18-11-99:—

Issue No.1.—Whether the termination of the petitioner

is illegal in view as section 25 F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. If so, its effect ?

OPP.

In the Court of Mrs. Aruna Kapoor, Presiding Judge,  
Himachal Pradesh Labour Court, Shimla

Issue No. 2. Relief .

### FINDINGS

6. Issue No. 1.—Petitioner while stepping in to the witness box has mentioned that he has worked from April, 79 till 9-11-1989 with the respondent and he was issued certificate Ex. PA and Ex. PB regarding his efficiency and tenure of employment. He has also mentioned that he made representations on 4-8-1988 for regularisation his service as opr Ex. PC and Ex. PD. However, persons junior to him were kept, whereas his services were terminated without any notice or compensation. Only cross examination done on him, is that no person has been engaged in place of the petitioner.

7. To rebut this evidence Shri N. S. Chaudhry, Assistant Director Fisheries has stoded in to the witness box and mentioned that petitioner was engaged on muster-roll basis from April 80 to August 89 and he did complete 240 days in between in some of the years. Thereafter the facility of engaging daily wagers was withdrawn and so the petitioner was terminated. He admits that neither any notice nor any retrenchment compensation was given to him. He also admits that the petitioner had completed more than 240 days in the calender year 1988 & 1989. He has also admitted certificate issued to the petitioner, but has mentioned that the persons issuing the certificates had no authority.

8. The evidence which has come on record proves that the petitioner did complete more than 240 days in the calendar year preceding his termination on 9-11-89. The only explanation which has been given by the respondent is that powers to employ on daily wages stood withdrawn as per the notification of the Government of Himachal Pradesh. Even if such powers had been withdrawn the petitioner was entitled to a notice and retrenchment compensation and also all other legal dues. His services could not have been terminated without complying with the provisions of section 25 F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The petitioner therefore has been illegally terminated without complying with the provisions of section 25 F of the Act as admittedly no retrenchment compensation was paid to him, though he was working on muster-roll basis from 1980 to August 89. He has also exhibited two certificates showing his continuous employment with the respondent from 16-6-80 to August 89. Therefore, the termination of the petitioner is illegal and un-justified. I, therefore, hold that the petitioner is entitled to reinstatement with full back seniority. However, the petitioner has not staked any claim for the wages while appearing in the witness box. He has not mentioned that he remained un-employed during this period and was not employed gainfully. Moreover petitioner has not made the claim till 1998 and kept on sleeping over his right. I, therefore hold that he is not entitled to back wages, though he is entitled to back seniority. Issue is decided accordingly.

### RELIEF

9. Keeping view the aforesaid discussion and findings I hold that the termination of the petitioner is illegal and unjustified and the petitioner is re-instated in service with full back seniority but without back wages. The reference is answered in affirmative. Let a copy of this award be sent to the appropriate government for its publication in accordance with law.

Announced in the Open Court today this 27th Day of February, 2001.

Seal.

ARUNA KAPOOR,  
Presiding Judge,  
H.P. Labour Court, Shimla.

Ref. No. 12 of 1999

Instituted on 17-2-99

Decided on 1-3-2001

Shrt Sukh Ram son of Shri Sunder Ram, Village Dhamna, P.O., Tehsil and District Bilaspur, Himachal Pradesh .. Petitioner.

Versus

Executive Engineer, HPPWD, Division No. 1, Bilaspur, Himachal Pradesh .. Respondent.

Reference under section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

For petitioner ; Shri Sunder Singh, A. R.

For respondent ; Shri Sukh Dev, A. R.

### AWARD

This reference has been received from the appropriate Government. Petitioner has alleged that he has been terminated from service without complying with the provisions of section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. It is submitted by him that he was employed on daily wages by the respondent and worked from 15-1-1992 to 27-5-1993. However, by a verbal order, his services were terminated on 28-5-1993 without serving any notice or furnishing any reason. Further submitted that persons junior to him were appointed during 1995-1996 and 1997 and despite his request, he was not given any employment. He has also submitted that retrenchment compensation was also not paid to him nor the principle of first come last go was adhered to. Therefore, the termination of the petitioner is illegal and he is liable to be re-instated in service with full back wages and full seniority.

2. In the reply filed by the respondent, it is admitted that petitioner worked from 15-1-1992 to 27-5-1993. However, that he was not retrenched, but was discharged alongwith other casual labourers. It is contended that the Department of P.W.D. engages casual labourers temporarily against seasonal and emergent workers and on completion of such workers, the casual labour thus engaged is disengaged/retrenched. It is submitted that the petitioner might not have come after this for the work and therefore, was not kept. However, it is mentioned that no persons Junior to the petitioner were employed. It is also mentioned that petition did not make any representation lastly that petition is time barred. Hence, it may be dismissed.

3. On the pleadings of the parties, my learned predecessor framed the following issues on 14-12-1999 ;—

1. Whether the termination of the petitioner is illegal in view of Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 ? If so, its effect ?

OPP.

2. Relief.

### FINDINGS

4. Issue No. 1.—To prove his claim, petitioner has come into the witness box and on behalf of the respondent, Shri Pritam Singh, Assistant Engineer has appeared. RW-1 has admitted that petitioner worked for 347 days in 1992 and 114 days in 1993. In view of this statement, it is established that petitioner did complete more than 240 days in the calendar year preceding his disengagement. However, the stand taken by the respondent during evidence is different than the one taken in the reply by the respondent. It has been mentioned by RW-1 that petitioner left the job on his own and did not approach the department, whereas, in the reply the plea taken is that Department

of PWD generally engages workers for seasonal and emergent work and on completion of the work, they are disengaged. Therefore, the evidence which has been lead by the respondent does not prove that the petitioner abandoned the job himself. Moreover, it is not established by the respondent that the petitioner was engaged for seasonal or emergent work and that work came to an end on 27-5-1993.

5. Since the petitioner has completed more than 240 days, he was entitled to certain benefits under the Industrial Disputes Act. He was entitled to the notice, retrenchment compensation and if no notice was served then wages for the notice period. None of these formalities have been completed and complied with and as I have already mentioned above, the abandonment of the job by the petitioner is not established on the record. Therefore, petitioner's services has been terminated in violation of Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. Petitioner has also mentioned that person junior to him have been engaged though he has not been able to name such persons, but again cross-examination of RW. 1 reveals that the respondent keeps labourers for 89 days and thereafter they are disengaged. He has also mentioned that the department does not maintain the seniority list. This shows that in order to wriggle out of the legal obligation, the employment is being given only for 89 days to frustrate the genuine cause of the labourers like petitioner. So, for all these reasons, I hold that the termination of the petitioner is illegal as per Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

6. The petitioner has mentioned that he was unemployed, and so he may be re-instated with back wages. The respondent has not led any evidence to prove the contrary. However, the fact that he did not make any representation till 1999 when the matter was referred by the State Government for the first time is not entitled to full back wages so back wages to the extent of 20 % will be adequate in these circumstances, petitioner is entitled to the seniority as per law. Issue is decided accordingly.

#### RELIEF

7. Keeping in view the aforesaid findings and discussion, I hold that the termination of the petitioner is illegal in view of Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. However, the petitioner is only entitled to the back wages to the extent of 20%. However, he is entitled to back seniority in accordance with law. Let a copy of this award be sent to the appropriate government for its publication in the H. P. Rajapatra.

Announced in the Open Court today this 1st day of March, 2001.

Seal.

ARUNA KAPOOR,  
Presiding Judge,  
Himachal Pradesh Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Shimla.

In the Court of Mrs. Aruna Kapoor, Presiding Judge  
Himachal Pradesh Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour  
Court, Shimla

Ref. 170/99

Decided on 13-3-2001

Shri Govind Ram & Shri Tawaru Ram ... Petitioner.

v/s.

The Resident Engg. Baasi Power House HPSEC,  
J/nagar, Mandi.

Reference under section 10 of the Industrial Disputes  
Act, 1947.

13-3-2001:-

Present:-Sh. N. L. Kaundal AR for petitioner.  
Sh. S. P. Sharma AR for the respondent.

The Ld. A R of petitioners has stated that one of the petitioners Sh. Tawaru Ram has expired. Further stated that petitioner Sh. Govind Ram and legal heirs of Sh. T. waru Ram are not interested to pursue their claim.

In view of the statement made by the Ld. A R of the petitioners, the reference is answered in negative. Let a copy of this order be sent for publication in accordance with law.

Seal.

ARUNA KAPOOR,  
Presiding Judge,  
H. P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-  
Labour Court, Shimla.

In the Court of Mrs. Aruna Kapoor, Presiding Judge,  
Himachal Pradesh Labour Court, Shimla

Ref. No. 62 of 1997  
Instituted on 28-4-1997  
Decided on 16-3-2001

1. Pawan Kumar

2. Chanan Singh

.. Petitioner.

Versus

Managing Director State Industries Development  
Corporation, Himachal Pradesh, Shimla  
.. Respondent.

Reference under section 10 of the Industrial Disputes  
Act, 1947.

For petitioners : Shri Sunder Singh, A.R.

For respondent : Shri H. K. Sharma, Advocate.

#### AWARD

This reference has been received from the appropriate government regarding the validity of the termination of the petitioners.

2. In the claim petition, petitioners have alleged that they joined as daily wages beldars on 1-8-94 and 1-10-93 respectively with the respondent and continued till 30-4-95. Thereafter, their services were terminated without any notice, compensation etc. and therefore, which is illegal and they are entitled to be re-instated with seniority and back wages.

3. In the reply filed by the respondent, preliminary objection has been taken that petition is not maintainable as the services of the petitioners were not retrenched by the respondent. It is also alleged that the work against which the petitioner were employed has since been completed and persons who are junior most are being retrenched. Therefore they cannot be re-instated in service.

4. On merits, it is contended the petitioner worked till 1-5-1995 and had completed 240 days. However, the work was abandoned for one month and petitioners as well as other workers were asked to report for duty on 1-6-1995 & though 23 casual beldars reported back and were re-employed. Petitioners did not turn up and so they were not kept. It is submitted that since the petitioners themselves did not report for duty on 1-6-1995, therefore, they are not entitled to be re-instated in service. It is also emphasized that their services were not disengaged by the respondent. Hence that the petition be dismissed.

5. On the pleadings of the parties, my learned predecessor framed the following issues on 27-8-97:—

1. Whether the termination of the services of the petitioners ordered by the respondent is violative of section 25-F of the act on the rounds as alleged? ..OPP.

2. Relief.

### FINDINGS

6. *Issue No. 1.*—As per the statements of the witnesses examined by the petitioner as well as by the respondent, it is proved that the petitioner were working with the respondent and had completed 240 days in the calendar year preceding their disengagement. The facts further show that on 1-5-1995 the work was abandoned by the respondent and the petitioners as well as some other labourers were disengaged and were told to come back on 1-6-1995. Therefore, it cannot be said that on 30-4-1995, petitioners left the job on their own. There is nothing on record to show nor it has been proved by any oral or documentary evidence that petitioners had been employed for a specific period or for a specific work and their services came to an automatic halt on 30-4-1995. Therefore, technically, they were terminated by the respondent on 30-4-1995 and were assured that they will be re-engaged after a certain gap.

7. The contention of the petitioner is that the reported for job on 1-6-1995, but they were not given the employment. Only one of the petitioners Pawan Kumar has stepped into the witness box and the other petitioner has not made any statement on oath that he was not re-employed on 1-6-1995. On the other hand, respondent has examined five witnesses to prove their claim that the petitioners themselves did not report for duty on 1-6-1995 and so were not kept. The S. D. O. working at the relevant time Shri Vijay Sharma, two workers Bhag Singh and Punnu Ram and the present Deputy Manager, H. P. S. E. D. C. have stepped into the witness box to prove this contention. Shri Punnu Ram and Bhag Singh have stated that they were working a Gawalthai and they were about 40 persons working there. They have also mentioned that the work was abandoned on 30-4-1995 but they were called back on 1-6-1995. They have deposed that both the petitioner did not turn up on 1-6-1995. In the cross-examination, both of them have admitted that the houses of the petitioners are at a very short distance from the place of work.

8. No doubt, respondents have examined two of the co-workers to prove their contentions, but the facts remains that the workers are still in the employment of the respondent. So their version may not be independent because they are still working with the Respondent and are themselves in need of job hence are not in a position to take a stand contrary to their employers. Moreover, since petitioners were working regularly till 30-4-1995 and work place was at a very short distance from their houses, there cannot be any reason for them not to report for duty alongwith others. Even otherwise, the material and date for the disengagement is 30-4-1995 and not 1-6-1994. Admittedly, the work was abandoned on that day and so the services were disengaged by the respondent and since the petitioners had completed 240 days in a calendar year preceding their termination, they were entitled to the safeguards mentioned under section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes act i.e. a notice stating reason for their disengagement wages for one month in lieu of notice and the retrenchment compensation. None of these formalities were completed. Therefore, their disengagement on 30-4-1995 is illegal.

9. I am also of the opinion that the respondent has not been able to establish that the petitioners themselves did not appear for duty on 1-6-1995 and so they were not given the job. The petitioners had moved the appropriate conciliation authorities within a reasonable time. It further strengthens the case of the petitioners that they were willing to work, but were not given the work by the respondent.

10. The learned counsel for the respondent has also argued that since petitioner No. 2 has not stepped into the witness box, therefore, his case is not proved. I agree with this contention that petitioner No. 2 has not made the statement on oath that he infact reported for duty on 1-6-1995 and Shri Pawan Kumar has not mentioned any thing about Chanan Singh being also present with him at the site of work on 1-6-1995. Therefore, as far as the petitioner Chanan Singh is concerned, his claim is not proved, but petitioner Pawan Kumar has been able to establish his termination as violative of section 25. F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. I, therefore, hold that the claim petition quu Pawan Kumar succeeds, whereas with regard to Chanan Singh, it is rejected. The point is answered accordingly.

### RELIEF

11. Keeping in view the aforesaid findings and discussion, I hold that the petitioner Pawan Kumar be re-instated in service with full back seniority. However, in the peculiar circumstances of the case, he is entitled to 20% of the wages. He has not stated by thing on oath that he was not gainfully employed during this period. Hence, the reference is answered in affirmative. Let a copy of this award be sent to the appropriate government for its publication in the H. P. Rajpatra in accordance with law.

Announced in the Open Court today this 16th Day of March, 2001.

Seal

ARUNA KAPOOR,  
Presiding Judge,  
H.P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour  
Court, Shimla.

In the Court of Mrs. Aruna Kapoor, Presiding Judge, Himachal Pradesh Labour Court, Shimla

Ref. No. 198 of 1998

Instituted on 23-9-98

Decided on 16-3-2001

Shri Dole Ram son of Shri Gauri Dutt, Resident of Village Goutu, Post Office Bilini, Tehsil Thunag, District Mandi, Himachal Pradesh .. Petitioner.

Versus

The Executive Engineer, Irrigation & Public Health, Sundernagar, District Mandi, Himachal Pradesh .. Respondent.

Reference under section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

For petitioner : Shri B. C. Singh, Advocate

For respondent : Shri Sohan Lal Gupta, A. R.

### AWARD

This reference has been received from the appropriate government. Petitioner has alleged in the claim petition that he was employed as beldar in Irrigation & Public Health Division Thunag in 1987 and he worked upto July, 1989. Further that his services were terminated without any notice or compensation under Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. Hence that the respondent be directed to re-engage him in the same place and in the same capacity.

2. In the reply filed by the respondent, preliminary objection that petition is not maintainable and it is time barred have been raised.

3. On merits, it is admitted that petitioner completed 240 days as beldar in 1988 and 189 days in 1989. However, that the services of the petitioner were not disengaged by the respondent, but the abandoned the job himself. It is also contended that the work on which

the petitioner was engaged was over during the year, 1990 and so he cannot be engaged now.

4. On pleadings of the parties, my learned predecessor framed the following issues on 18-11-1999:—

1. Whether the termination of the petitioner is illegal in view of Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 ? If so, its effect ? . . . OPP.
2. Relief.

### FINDINGS

5. **Issue No. 1.**—The petitioner has stopped into the witness box himself, whereas Shri Sohan Lal, Assistant Engineer appeared on behalf of the respondent. The statements reveals that the petitioner joined in July, 1987 and completed 240 days in 1988 and 189 days in 1989. However, the basic issue is whether the petitioner abandoned the job himself or he was disengaged. The contention of the respondent is that he did not come for the duty himself, but they have also alleged that the work for which the petitioner was engaged was finished in 1990. The R. W. has admitted that no notice was served on the petitioner to resume his duties. He has also not been able to dispute that the persons junior to the petitioner are still engaged. He is also unaware whether any written or oral representation has been made by the petitioner or that he was assured that he will be kept as and when the work is available.

6. Petitioner on the other hand contended that his services were terminated and the persons like Jawahar Lal, Jayoti Parkash, Gopal Singh, Khem Raj, Roshan Lal, Kishan Chand were employed. He has also tendered an affidavit Ex. PW-1/A ascertaining that the persons Junior to him were given employment. He has also exhibited the copy of the notice Ex. PW-1/B, which he allegedly served on the respondent. In the affidavit Ex. PW-1/A, he was given specific date of re-engagement of Shri Kishan Chand, Roshan Lal, Khem Chand and Raj Kumar. This affidavit has not been controverted.

7. The statement of the petitioner on oath and the affidavit establishes that the work has not been completed in the year, 1990 as is being alleged by the respondent. Rather, new persons have been engaged sometime in the year, 1992-93. Therefore, this plea of the respondent fails as the specific affidavit filed by the petitioner in this regard has not been controverted and the statement of R. W. is vague and evasive. Moreover, the respondent has not been able to prove that the petitioner abandoned the job himself. Therefore, it appears that his services were disengaged without compliance of Section 25-F of the Act. I, therefore, hold that the petitioner is entitled to re-instatement with full seniority. However, since the petitioner slept over his right for a long period of 7 years and has not mentioned that he was not gainfully employed during this period, I hold that he is not entitled to back wages. Issue is decided accordingly.

### RELIEF

8. Keeping in view the aforesaid discussions and findings, I hold that the termination of the petitioner is illegal and he is entitled to re-instatement with back seniority as per law. However, he is not entitled to any back wages. The reference is answered in affirmative. Let a copy of this award be sent to the appropriate government for its publication.

Announced in the Open Court today this 16th Day of March, 2001.

Seal.

ARUNA KAPOOR,  
Presiding Judge,  
H. P Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court,  
Shimla.

In the Court of Smt. Aruna Kapoor, Presiding Judge,  
Himachal Pradesh Labour Court, Shimla

Case Ref. 64/91

Instituted on 8-12-1997

Decided on 16-3-2001

In re :

Shri Kapil Dev

.. Petitioner.

Versus

Chairman of the Board of Director of H. P. Small Industries and Export Corporation through Private Secretary to the Hon'ble Industries Minister of Himachal Pradesh and ors. .. Respondents.

Reference under section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

For Petitioner : Shri J. C. Bharwaj, A. R.

For Respondents : Shri Bhuvnesh Sharma, Advocate.

### AWARD

The present reference was initially received from the State of Himachal Pradesh *vide* its notification dated 8-8-91 and the following disputes were referred for adjudication under section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :

1. Whether the action of the Managing Director Himachal Pradesh State Small Industries and Export Corporation Ltd, Shimla in transferring Shri Kapil Dev, Store Keeper on 2-2-84 and his placement as a clerk at the Headquarters is legal and justified if illegal, to amount of relief and compensation, Shri Kapil Dev workman is entitled to ?
2. Whether the demand of Shri Kapil Dev for the pay scale of Rs. 570—1080 from the Managing Director, Himachal Pradesh State Small Industries and Export Corporation Ltd, Shimla *w.e.f.* 4-8-80 (Date of appointment) to 1-2-1984 as Store Keeper is legal and justified ? If legal from what date the petitioner is entitled to the said pay scale ?
3. The petitioner Kapil Dev has claimed that he was appointed as storekeeper in the year 1980 in the pay scale of Rs. 400—650. It is further submitted that requisitioned were sent by the respondent management for two posts *i.e.* one of Clerk and the other of Store-keeper after his name was sponsored by the employment exchange and he was ultimately issued appointment letter as store keeper in the pay scale of Rs. 400—600. It is submitted by him that the advertisement and interview letter carried the pre-revised pay scale of Rs. 160—400 which was lateron revised to Rs. 570—1080. However, he was given lesser pay scale as per the appointment letter, so he represented against the same to the appropriate authority.

3. It is submitted that in the year 1984 seniority list was prepared and circulated where the petitioner has not been assigned the seniority due to him. So he made the representation but to no avail. Petitioner has now claimed that he should be given the pay of pre revised scale of Rs. 160—400 at the time initial appointment and all other consequential benefits.

The point of dispute which is required to adjudicated now as per the orders of the Hon'ble the High Court is however confined whether the placement in seniority of Shri Kapil Dev storekeeper as Clerk on his transfer/ absorption at the headquarter on 2-2-84 is legal and justified.

Announced in the open Court to day this 16th March  
2001.

Seal.

ARUNA KAPOOR,

Presiding Judge,  
H. P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court,  
Shimla.

In the Court of Mrs. Aruna Kapoor, Presiding Judge,  
Himachal Pradesh Labour Court, Shimla

Ref. No. 3 of 1996

Instituted on 4-4-1996  
Decided on 17-3-2001

Shri Bhag Singh s/o Shri Lachman Singh, Village  
Miapur, P. O. Kajheri, Tehsil Kharar, District Ropar  
Punjab  
Petitioner.

Versus

Bharat Petrofoam Company Private Ltd. Barotiwala,  
District Solan, Himachal Pradesh, Through its Managing  
Director.  
Respondent.

For Petitioner: Shri Hem Raj, AR.

For respondent: Ex-parte.

## AWARD

1. This reference has been received from the appropriate Government. The petitioner has mentioned in the claim petition that he was working as a driver with the respondent from 1984 till 20-7-1994 and he was an active member of the Trade Union. Therefore, in order to victimize him, transfer order was served on the petitioner ordering him to join duties at Delhi instead of Baroti-wala. The petitioner being aggrieved by this order raised an Industrial Dispute. However, no settlement could be arrived at and the matter was referred to this Court. Petitioner has alleged that he has been victimized by the respondent for Trade Union activities and has been transferred to punish him.

2. Order sheet reveals that though the respondent was served and certain persons were putting in their presence on behalf of the respondent as its ARS, yet neither any reply was filed nor any other steps to defend the claim were taken. The order sheet dated 11-3-1999 reveals that a lady advocate Mrs. Veena Sood put in her appearance on behalf of the respondent and took time for moving an application for setting aside the ex-parte, but thereafter, did not take any steps. Then the ex-parte which were done by my learned predecessor continued. Ex-parte evidence was examined. Petitioner has filed an affidavit in support of his claim alongwith certain documents like the transfer order and the representations made by him to the management from time to time.

3. In his affidavit, petitioner has alleged that he was working as a driver and was indulging in Trade Union activities which probably annoyed the management and to punish him, he has been transferred to Delhi. He has also mentioned that there is no unit or work in Delhi except the Head Office where the managerial staff operates and so he has been transferred with malafide objectives and therefore the order be quashed.

4. Since neither the claim made in the petition nor the affidavit filed by the petitioner have been controverted despite knowledge of the allegation. Therefore, it seems that the allegations made by the petitioner of his transfer being by way of a punishment due to trade union activities have to be accepted. Further the petitioner has sworn that he has been employed as a Driver and in Delhi, there is no unit or work for him, but despite that he has been transferred by way of punishment. In view of these uncontroverted and unrebutted allegations, I hold that the petitioner's transfer is *malafide* and is required

## RELIEF

22. Keeping in view the discussions made above, I answer the reference holding that according to the Managing Director, Himachal State Small Industries and Export Corporation Ltd., Shimla in transferring Shri Kapil Dev on 2-2-1984 and placing him as a Clerk at the Headquarter is legal and justified and he is not entitled to any relief and compensation. I, further hold that the demand of Shri Kapil Dev for the pay scale of Rs. 570-1080 from the Managing Director, H. P. Small scale Industries and Export Corporation w. e. f. 4-8-1980 to 1-2-1984 as Store-keeper is illegal and unjustified. The reference is answered accordingly. Let a copy of this award be sent to appropriate Government for its publication in the Himachal Pradesh Rajpatha.

to be quashed, I, therefore decide this reference in favour of the petitioner holding that the transfer order issued by the management of M/s. Bharat Petrofoam Company, Barotiwala on 20-7-1994 are illegal and bad and are liable to be quashed. Petitioner is entitled to be transferred back to Barotiwala. Hence, the reference is answered in affirmative. Let a copy of this award be sent to the appropriate Government for its publication in the Himachal Pradesh Rajpatra in accordance with law.

Announced in the open Court today this 17th day of March, 2001.

Seal.

ARUNA KAPOOR,  
Presiding Judge,  
H. P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Shimla.

In the Court of Mrs. Aruna Kapoor, Presiding Judge,  
Himachal Pradesh, Labour Court, Shimla

Ref. No. 41 of 1999

Instituted on : 4-3-1999

Decided on : 19-3-2001

S/Shri Roshan Lal, Ravi Dutt and Brij Lal ...Petitioners

Versus

Executive Engineer, Parwati Invest Division, No. II, H.P.S.E.B., Sarabai Bhunter Kullu, Himachal Pradesh  
... Respondent,

Reference under section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

For petitioners : Shri N. L. Kaundal, AR.

For Respondent : Shri Raj Kumar, AR.

#### AWARD

This reference has been received from the appropriate Government with regard to the termination of the services of petitioners Roshan Lal, Ravi Dutt and Brij Lal. Petitioners in their claim petition have mentioned that they were working as daily waged beldars in Uhl Project, Construction Division, Jodhpur and continued to do so till their services were terminated orally without compliance of the provisions of section 25-F and N of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. It is also contended that the principle of last come first go was not adhered to. Hence, their termination is illegal. Petitioners also alleged that a legal notice was sent through an advocate in 1996 and reply was received in which certain information had been sought from them and all the relevant documents and information was accordingly sent to the respondent, but to no avail. Thereafter, demand notice was served on the respondent. It is submitted that the petitioners be reinstated in service with full back wages and seniority as their termination is illegal.

2. In reply filed to these claim petitioners it is submitted that the petition is bad in law for non joinder of necessary parties. Secondly it is barred by limitation and lastly that material facts have been suppressed by the petitioners. Hence, they are not entitled to the relief. The respondents however admitted that the petitioners were working with them as per the document Ex. R-1. However, that their services were not terminated, but they left the job themselves. It is also mentioned that uninterrupted 240 days service was not performed by any of the petitioners in any of the calendar year. Hence, they are not entitled to any relief. It is also submitted that information as was sought were not supplied by the petitioners. The reply is supported by Annexure R-1 with regard to the actual working days of petitioner No. 1. Roshan Lal.

3. On the pleadings of the parties, the following issues were framed on 3-5-2000:-

1. Whether the petitioners are entitled to the benefits as claimed in the petition *OPP.*
2. Whether the petition is not maintainable as alleged ? *OPR.*
3. Relief.

#### FINDINGS

4. *Issue No. 1.*—Petitioners Roshan Lal and Brij Lal have appeared in the witness box and their statements have remained un-rebutted as they were not cross-examined by the respondent. Respondent was proceeded against *ex parte* though it was properly served and had been attending the Court in the past. In the statement, petitioner Roshan Lal has mentioned that he worked from 7-9-1989 to 20-9-1990 and he worked for 240 days in the calendar year. He has relied on the document Ex. P. A. which is Annexure R-1 filed by the respondent. He has also mentioned that the muster roll issued on 21-9-1990 did not reflect his name which shows that his services were disengaged by the respondent. He has also mentioned that he met Division Incharge and he was called to the office *vide* letter Ex. PD. He further mentioned that he was told that work has finished in 1990. However, that work has re-started in 1992. Therefore, he may be re-instated.

5. Similarly, Shri Brij Lal has mentioned that he worked from 17-10-1988 to 20-4-1991. He worked for more than 240 days and his services were terminated without any notice or compensation. He has exhibited the muster roll Ex. PF, PG, PH and PJ regarding his working days. The third petitioner namely Shri Ravi Dutt has not been examined nor any documentary evidence pertaining to him has been exhibited.

6. In view of the un-rebutted statement of Shri Roshan Lal coupled with the documents and statement of Shri Brij Lal coupled with the muster rolls, it is established that petitioners have worked for more than 240 days in the calendar year preceding their disengagement but the respondent has not been able to prove that the disengagement was due to the abandonment of the job of the petitioner as no evidence has come in this regard. Therefore, I hold that the services of the petitioner Roshan Lal and Brij Lal were terminated without complying with the provisions of section 25-F of the act and they are entitled to be re-instated in service. However, the petitioners did not agitate the matter from 1990 till 1996 and slept over their right for six years. In these circumstances, they are not entitled to the back wages though they are entitled to the seniority as per law. I, therefore, decide this issue accordingly.

7. *Issue No. 2.*—Respondent has taken the objection that petition is not maintainable, but no evidence has been led to prove this aspect of this case. It has been submitted that certain material facts have been suppressed, secondly that the petition is bad in law for non joinder of the necessary parties and lastly that it is barred by limitation. However, no oral or documentary evidence has been produced to prove these aspects. Law of limitation is not applicable. Suppression of material facts is also not made out and it is not established that the petition suffers from non joinder of the parties. Therefore, the issue is decided against the respondent.

#### RELIEF

8. Keeping in view the aforesaid findings and discussion, I hold that the termination of the petitioner Roshan Lal and Brij Lal is illegal and I hold that they be re-engaged in service with full back seniority but without back wages. Reference is answered accordingly in affirmative. Reference given by Ravi Dutt is answered against him for lack of evidence. Let a copy of this award be sent to the appropriate Government for its publication.

4. Respondent management has rebutted the claim of the petitioner by alleging that petitioner had been given the pay on the pattern of Himtron workers. He was issued the appointment letter and specifically the pay scale of Rs. 400- 650 was offered to him, which he accepted. Therefore he was absorbed in the Head Office as a Clerk and the scale prevalent in the Head Office of a Clerk was given to him. Therefore he is not entitled to any monetary benefits of higher pay scales or seniority as seniority has been rightly fixed by the respondent.

5. On the pleadings of the parties, my learned predecessor framed the following issues:

1. Whether the transfer of Shri Kapil Dev, petitioner from the post of storekeeper to the post of clerk w. e. f. 2-2-1984 is illegal and unjustified? (O.P. Parties)
2. Whether the petitioner is entitled for the pay of the storekeeper w. e. f. 4-8-1980 to 1-2-1984? (OPP.)
3. Whether the petition is not maintainable as alleged? (O.P.R.)
4. Relief.

6. Vide the award of my I.d. predecessor dated 25-7-92, petitioner was held entitled to the pay scale of Rs. 160-400 (pre-revised) w. e. f. 4/89 and it was ordered that he be paid the arrears within one month. He was also awarded all subsequent revisions in the pay. It was also held that petitioner could not be shown in the seniority list of the clerks and he will be deemed to have been appointed as storekeeper in the pay scale of Rs. 160-400 as per record.

7. The matter came up before the Hon'ble High Court of Himachal Pradesh by way of C.W.P. No. 144/93. The Hon'ble High Court quashed the orders passed by my I.d. predecessor vide its judgement dated 27-12-95. It was held by the Hon'ble High Court that at the time of appointment, petitioner Kapil Dev could have refused the offer made to join as storekeeper in the pay scale of Rs. 400-660 (Revised). It was further observed that the petitioner not only accepted the job offer but furnished the necessary bonds as required by the management. Therefore, he is not entitled to make this grievance. It was also observed by the Hon'ble High Court that since the unit of the respondent namely Himtron where petitioner Kapil Dev was initially employed had been closed. Therefore, in order to provide him employment he was re-designated as clerk-cum-storekeeper in the head office in order to meet the social obligation towards him because otherwise since the unit had been closed and there was no post of storekeeper in the Head Office at Shimla, where petitioner had been transferred, so his service could have been dispensed with at that time in accordance with law. Hon'ble High Court also dispelled the theory of equal pay for equal work in the present case of the petitioner holding that in view of the inherent limitation enshrined there the doctrine of equal pay for equal work, was not attracted and petitioner was not entitled to the pay scale of storekeeper prevalent in the other office. By the orders of the Hon'ble High Court, therefore, the orders passed by this Court were quashed.

8. The petitioner thereafter filed a special leave to appeal before Hon'ble Supreme Court but later on withdrew it with the liberty to file review petition before the Hon'ble High Court and the matter was adjudicated upon again on 5-11-1997.

9. It has been mentioned in the order of the Hon'ble High Court in the review petition that petitioner Kapil Dev had confined his claim regarding his seniority viz-a-viz his juniors and Hon'ble High Court observed that in the interest of justice the petitioner is entitled to appropriate place in seniority list of clerks on his transfer from Himtron to head office where he was re-designated as Clerk-cum-Storekeeper. Accordingly, it was observed;

"taking into account totality of the facts and circumstances of the case, we feel that the

claim of the petitioner regarding assigning his appropriate place in the seniority of clerk in the Head office of the Respondent No. 1 needs to be adjudicated upon and thereafter assign him his rightful place in the concerned list, accordingly, this review petition is allowed and consequently the writ petition is restored to its original position.

Since we have taken the view that the petitioner is entitled to his assignment of his proper place in the seniority list of clerks from the date he was transferred to the Head Office. The matter is ordered to be remanded back to the Labour Court, Himachal Pradesh, Shimla with the direction to adjudicate the claim of the petitioner regarding his placement in the seniority list of clerks maintained by respondent No. 1, after he had been transferred to Head Office from Himtron factory. It is further ordered that the petitioner shall implead such other persons as respondents before the Labour Court above whom he claims to be placed in the seniority list. It is made clear that except for being assigned his proper place in the seniority list he shall not be entitled to any consequential monetary or other benefits. Subject to the aforesaid, the writ petition is also disposed off without affecting the judgement already given in CWP 144/93 in manner. Costs on the parties."

10. As a consequence, the matter has been received on remand. As per the orders of the Hon'ble High Court petitioner amended his claim petition and added respondent No. 6 to 25 over whom he is claiming seniority. Notices were issued to all the respondents who were added and they filed reply in three different groups i. e. respondent No. 8, 12 and 18 filed the reply jointly, respondent No. 7, 9, 11, 13 to 17 filed another set of reply and respondents No. 21 to 25 filed third set of reply to the claim petition. Other respondent chose not to file any specific reply to the allegations made in the amended claim petition. However, despite three sets of reply identical difference please have been raised by the respondents. They have raised the preliminary objections that since petitioner was absorbed in the respondents corporation only in the year 1984. He can not be placed above the replying respondents, and further that seniority list circulated on 13-3-1984 is correctly prepared and the petitioner has been rightly placed at serial No. 23. It is further submitted that Hon'ble High Court had held that petitioner can be given seniority only from the date of his absorption in the respondents corporation and in fact petitioner was absorbed only in March, 1985. So in fact he was entitled to seniority from that date, but the respondent corporation has taken a lenient view and has given him the seniority w. e. f. 2-2-1984.

11. On merits respondents have taken the place that all other claims of the petitioner have already been adjudicated upon and rejected by the Hon'ble High Court except the claim of seniority viz-a-viz the date when he was absorbed in the Head Office. Yet it is submitted that petitioner was given appointment of storekeeper in the Himtron factory in the pay scale of Rs. 400- 650 with fixed allowances which he accepted. Thereafter, the Storekeeper working in the Himtron were ordered to be placed in the pay scale of Rs. 400- 600 with allowances as admissible to the employees of the corporation vide order dated 2-2-1984 and therefore, the petitioner who was absorbed as clerk was given this pay scale and seniority w. e. f. 2-2-1984. It is submitted that petitioner is not entitled to the seniority from the date prior to 2-2-1984 as he was not working in this cadre before that date. Hence that the claim of the petitioner deserves to be dismissed.

12. On the pleadings of the parties following additional issues were framed on 22-12-2000:

3. A. whether respondents 8, 12 & 18 joined the corporation before joining the services by the petitioner on his initial appointment as storekeeper on 4-8-80 if so its effect ? .OPR.

3. B. Whether the petitioner is entitled to be placed in the seniority list of clerks only from the date he was transferred i. e. on 20-3-1985/2-2-1984 as alleged ? .OPR.

3. C. Whether the petitioner has been rightly placed at serial No.23 in the seniority list as alleged ? .OPR.

4. Relief.

13. It is apparent that except the determination of the seniority of the petitioner on the date when he joined the Head Office on transfer from Himtron, all other points received for adjudication have been adjudicated upon finally by Hon'ble the High Court. Therefore, the findings on the issue framed initially and framed subsequent to the remand are as follows :

FINDINGS

14. Issue No. 1. -Since Hon'ble the High Court has already held vide its order on the review petition that petitioner has given up the claim except the claim of seniority *vis a vis* the clerks working in the Head Office. Therefore, the question whether transfer of Shri Kapil Dev from the post of Storekeeper to the post of Clerk *w. e. f.* 2-2-1984 is illegal does not need any further adjudication. Hon'ble the High Court has held in its order dated 27-12-1995 are as follows :—

"We are of the view that the respondent No. 1 could have either refused at the time when the offer was made to him in the pay scale of Rs. 400-650 with fixed allowances and after having not only accepted the same and joined the service, but also having furnished the necessary bond as required by the management, he is not entitled to make any grievance. It is further pointed out that this bond was shown during the course of hearing on behalf of the petitioner-corporation and execution and submission thereof was not controverted by respondent No. 1. Further this submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner that since the unit of the petitioner *i. e.* Himtron, where respondent No. 1 was employed at Chambaghat (Solan), has since been closed, as such in order to provide him employment and not leave him high and dry, the petitioner had re designated him as clerk-cum Store Keeper keeping in view its social obligation towards its employees like respondent No. 1. Otherwise since the unit had been closed and there was no post of store keeper in the Head office at Shimla, where respondent No. 1 had been transferred, his services could be dispensed with at that time in accordance with law".

15. So, in view of these findings of the Hon'ble the High Court, issue is decided against the petitioner and in favour of the respondent.

16. Issue No. 2. In view of the findings returned on issue No. 1, the petitioner is not entitled to the pay of Store-keeper *i. e.* Rs. 160-400 (Pre-revised) from 4-8-1980 to 1-2-1984. The issue is decided against the petitioner.

17. Issue No. 3. - No arguments have been addressed on this issue. The petitioner is otherwise maintainable as it is with regard to the plea of anomaly of pay scale and seniority of the petitioner. Hence, the issue is

decided in favour of the petitioner and against the respondent.

18. Issue No.3A. In pursuance of the order of the Hon'ble the High Court, petitioner had joined Respondent No. 6 to 23 as the officials over whom he is claiming seniority. Respondent No. 8 Sushil Kumar, Respondent No. 12 Atma Ram Bhardwaj and Respondent No. 18 Shri Surinder Dutt Bhardwaj have taken the plea that they were appointed in the Head office even prior to the initial appointment of the petitioner on 4-8-1980. The list which was circulated on 13-3-1984 reflecting the seniority list of the Clerks reveals the initial date of appointment of Shri Atma Ram shown at Sl. No. 6 and Shri Surinder Dutt Bhardwaj shown at Sl. No. 12 as 22-3-1978 and 7-4-1979 respectively. The name of Shri Sushil Kumar, however, is not reflected in this list. The date of appointment of these persons have not been specifically challenged by the petitioner. Meaning thereby that as per list these persons have been appointed as Clerks even before the initial appointment of the petitioner as Store-Keeper. By no stretch of imagination, the petitioner can claim seniority over them. I may also add that as per this list, all the person shown at Sl. No. 1 to 13 have been appointed as Clerks before the initial appointment of the petitioner *i.e.* prior to 4-8-1980 when the petitioner had joined the Himtron unit. Therefore, the petitioner cannot claim seniority over them and the issue is decided against the petitioner.

19. Issue No. 3B & 3C. - Both these issues are being taken up together for disposal as they relate to the common question of law and fact.

20. The Hon'ble High Court has held that petitioner though was called for an interview of Store keeper in a higher pay scale, but he was offered a lower pay scale in the appointment letter and since, he accepted the offer made in the appointment letter, without any reservations and in fact furnished a bond as per the conditions of the appointment. Therefore, he cannot claim un-revised pay scale of Rs. 160-400. It has also been held by Hon'ble the High Court that transfer of petitioner from Himtron to Head office was infact for the benefit of the petitioner. Since the unit of Himtron was closing down and petitioner would have been on the road, had he not been absorbed in the Head Office against the post of Clerk. Therefore, the Hon'ble the High Court has held that transfer of the petitioner from Himtron to Head office on revised designation of Clerk cum-Storekeeper in the pay scale of Rs. 400-600 is legal and justified and is purely in pursuance of the social obligation of the employer towards the employee. Therefore, these points which have already been adjudicated upon cannot now be gone into. The only question which remains for consideration is whether the petitioner has been given the rightful seniority in the seniority list circulated on 13-3-1984. It is admitted that the petitioner joined in the Head Office on 20-3-1985. Letter dated 19-3-1985, issued by officer on Special Duty Shri R.C. Bhatnagar can be referred in this respect. Another letter which is relevant is dated 2-8-1984 which has been issued by the General Manager and is Ex. Rx-3. For the purpose of clarity, I will reproduce the contents of this office order .

"The question of bringing the ministerial staff posted at Himtron, Solan which unit is a part and parcel of this Corporation in the common cadre of this corporation has been under consideration for some time past. After careful consideration, the M. D. is pleased to order that hence forward the placing ministerial staff working in the said unit will form common cadre with that of Head office and other units of the Corporation. Accordingly, the officials working against these posts shall be entitled to the scales of pay and allowances etc. applicable to similar post in this Corporation from time to time."

21. This letter clearly speaks of forming a common cadre of the ministerial staff working in Himtron and in

Announced in the open court today this 19th day of March, 2001

Seal ARUNA KAPOOR,  
Presiding Judge H. P.,  
Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court,  
Shimla.

In the Court of Mrs. Aruna Kapoor, Presiding Judge,  
H. P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Shimla

Ref. No. 22 of 1999

Instituted on : 17-2-99

Decided on : 19-3-2001

Shri Nanda Ram son of Shri Shobha Ram, resident of  
Village Daudiwala, P. O. Amboya, Tehsil Paonta Sahib,  
District Shimla (H. P.) Petitioner.

V.

1. The Conservator of Forests, Nahan, Circle  
Nahan District Shimla, H. P.

2. The Divisional Forest Officer, Paonta Sahib,  
District Shimla, H. P.

Reference under section 10 of the Industrial Disputes  
Act, 1947.

For petitioner : Shri A. K. Gupta, Advocate.  
For respondent : Shri Surat Singh Tomar, A.R.

#### AWARD

1. This reference has been received from the appropriate Government. The claim petition filed by the petitioner reveals that he was working as daily waged beldar in the Forest Department at Paonta Sahib w. e. f. March, 1984 and his services were dispensed with in December, 1987 without complying with the mandatory provisions of section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. It is also contended that the persons junior to him were retained in service and also fresh engagements were made and violation of section 25-G and H of the Act, has also been committed. It is submitted that petitioner has worked for more than 240 days in a calendar year before his disengagement. Hence, he may be re-engaged with full back seniority and back wages.

2. In the reply filed by the respondents, it is mentioned that the petitioner left the work on his own without any intimation to the respondent. Therefore, he was not entitled to any compensation or other dues. Further the petitioner agitated the matter after a gap of 10 years. Hence his claim is barred by limitation.

3. On merits, it is contended that the petitioner worked from May, 1984 to September, 1987, but thereafter left the work on his own. Hence, petition deserves to be dismissed.

4. On the pleadings of the parties, my learned predecessor framed the following issues on 29-9-99:-

1. Whether the termination of the petitioner is illegal in view of Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 ? If so, its effect ?  
2. Relief

#### FINDINGS

5. Issue No. 1 - To prove his claim petitioner has stepped into the witness box and mentioned that he was working on daily wages from 1984 to 1988 and though fictional breaks were given to him, he completed 240 days but his services were terminated, whereas some of the persons like Julli Ram, Kashmukh, Surant Singh, Prem Singh, etc. were retained. He has however, mentioned

that no appointment letter was given to him. He has also mentioned that he made oral representations. He has relied upon document Annexure AR-1 wherein the respondent themselves have shown him to have worked for 245 days in 1984, 362 days in 1985 and 360 days in 1986. Rather Annexure AR-1 shows that till September, 1987 he has worked continuously.

6. The respondent has examined Shri Rajmal Forest Guard who has mentioned that Nanda Ram was working there, but he left the job on his own. He has also mentioned that the work was still going on when he left the job. He has also mentioned that he was called back through a local person to join, but he did not do so. However, he does not remember the person through whom the message was sent.

7. The evidence which has come on record is that the petitioner was working regularly from 1984 to September, 1987 and had completed more than 240 days of work in each calendar year preceding his disengagement. The main controversy the petitioner has abandoned the job himself or he has been terminated. Both petitioner and the respondents have set-up contrary claims. However, the record does not show that after the petitioner abandoned the job allegedly, he was served with any notice to join back or to explain his misconduct for remaining absent from duty. There is otherwise no evidence that the petitioner did not turn up for work after September, 1987. Therefore, in view of the statement of the petitioner on oath, I hold that the petitioner did not leave the work himself, rather his services were terminated.

8. The next question which has been argued is that the petitioner did not choose to report for 10 long years. Hence, the claim is barred by time. Since law of limitation is not applicable to the Industrial Dispute, therefore, technically petitioner cannot be rejected on the ground of limitation. However, the petitioner has slept over his right for last 10 years, therefore, he cannot be entitled for the back wages though he is entitled to the seniority as per law. I, therefore, hold that the petitioner is entitled to re-instatement as his termination is in violation of Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 being without any retrenchment compensation, show cause notice or pay for the notice period, but petitioner is not entitled to the back wages though he is entitled to seniority as per the law. Issue is decided accordingly.

#### RELIEF

9. Keeping in view the aforesaid findings and discussions, I hold that the termination of the petitioner is in violation of Section 25-F. I, therefore, hold that the petitioner is entitled to re-instatement with full back seniority, but without back wages. Reference is answered in affirmative. Let a copy of this award be sent to the appropriate Government for its publication in the Himachal Pradesh, Rajpath in accordance with law.

Announced in the Open Court today this 19th Day of March, 2001.

S. a.l.

ARUNA KAPOOR,  
Presiding Judge,  
H. P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court,  
Shimla.

In the Court of Presiding Judge, H. P. Industrial  
Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Shimla

Shri Dharminder Singh

V.

M/s. B.C.C. Kuba Ltd., V. & P.O. Nangal, Tehsil  
Nalagarh District Solan.

20-3-2001; Present : Shri J. C. Bhardwaj, A. R. For Petitioner.  
Shri Rajnish Maniktala For Respondent.

The Petitioner and the Management have Settled their claim outside the Court. The Memorandum of Settlement has been placed on record as Ex. P. A.

As per the Settlement Ex. P. A. which has been registered with the Conciliation Officer, the respondent has paid Rs. 10,000/- towards Full and final Settlement which has been accepted by petitioner. The petitioner has left his claim for reinstatement.

In view of Settlement Ex. P. A. The reference does not survive and is answered accordingly. Let a copy of this order be sent for publication in accordance with law.

Seal.

Sd/-

*Presiding Judge,  
H. P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court,  
Shimla.*

Sd/-

*Presiding Judge,  
H. P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court,  
Shimla.*

In the Court of Smt. Aruna Kapoor, Presiding Judge, Himachal Pradesh, Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Shimla

Ref. 203/98

Decided on : 21-3-2001

Shri Anant Ram

..Petitioner.

Vs.

M/s. Hotel Industry Pvt. Ltd. Prop. of Alasia Hotel  
Kashuli, District Solan ..Respondent.

*Reference Under Section 10 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947.*

21-3-2001 Present :

None.

Case has been called repeatedly. None has appeared. Hence reference is decided against the petitioner for non-prosecution.

Seal.

**ARUNA KAPOOR.**  
*Presiding Judge.*

*H. P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court,  
Shimla.*

In the Court of Presiding Judge, H. P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Shimla

Shri Vijay Rattan

Vs.

M/s. Jaysons Laboratories (P) Ltd., Parwanoo.

23-3-2001; Present : None.

Reference was received from the appropriate Government. However, neither the petitioner nor the respondent have appeared despite service as per the report received. The reference has been sent with regard to 34 workers

and though the reference mentions the list of workers is included, but no such list has been tagged with the reference. All the petitioners have been given one address of service i.e. Shri Vijay Rattan and 34 others c/o Shri Vijay Rattan, Rattan Voysht 206/2, Rye Pass Road, Solan, Himachal Pradesh Services has been affected or Shri Vijay Rattan through affiliation as per report received from the office of the Chief Judicial Magistrate Solan. However, none has appeared today despite case being called thrice. Similarly, the respondent has also been served through affiliation but none has appeared on their behalf as well. Therefore, the reference is being answered in negation for non prosecution of the case as despite opportunities none appeared. Let a copy of this order be sent to the appropriate Government for its publication in the Rajpatra in accordance with law.

Seal.

*Sd/-  
Presiding Judge,  
H. P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court,  
Shimla.*

In the Court of Smt. Aruna Kapoor, Presiding Judge, Himachal Pradesh Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court Shimla

Ref. No. 48/95

Instituted on 7-12-1995

Decided on 31-3-2001

*In re :*

Rajinder Singh, Driver c/o Ravinder Kumar, General Secretary, C. F. J. V. Workers Ekta Union (C. I. T. U.), P. O. Sholding Bhawa Nagar, District Kinnaur, Himachal Pradesh .. Petitioner.

.. Petitioner.

*Versus*

Continental Foundation Joint Venture (C. F. J. V.)  
H/o Sholding, Bhawa Nagar, District Kinnaur, H. P. 172115 through its Project Manager .. Respondent.

*Reference under section 10 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947*

**AWARD**

Shri Hem Raj, A. R. for Petitioner.

Shri Rajnish Maniktala, Adv. for respondent.

1. This reference has been received from the appropriate Government regarding the termination of the services of Shri Rajinder Singh, Driver by Continental Foundation Joint Venture, Head Office Sholding allegedly for not affording him opportunity to defend himself.

2. In the claim petition, petitioner has alleged that he was appointed as Driver on 30-3-94 on the monthly salary of Rs. 1350/- and was also paid project allowance (@ 30%) and difficult area allowance (@ 25%) on the said wages by the respondent. Further that a Union in the name and style of C. F. J. V. Workers Union was formed in December, 1994 and was duly registered. Petitioner was elected as Vice-President of the Union. It is contended that petitioner was dismissed from service vide letter No. 232/NJR-741, dated 8-3-95 on the charges of using abusive language and manhandling co-workers and seniors. Accordingly industrial dispute was raised, but the efforts of the conciliation-cum-labour Officer failed due to adamant attitude of the respondent.

3. Petitioner alleges that dismissal order has been passed without serving any chargesheet, without providing showcase notice, list of witnesses and he has been condemned unheard. Hence the dismissal orders are illegal and void and liable to be set-aside and petitioner is entitled to re-instatement with consequential relief of back wages and seniority etc.

4. In reply filed by the respondent it is admitted that petitioner was appointed as Driver on 30-3-94. However that there was a stipulation that he will be on probation for a period of six months which may be extended at the discretion of the management and unless until he was confirmed by a specific letter he would be deemed to be in extended probation. Factum of the formation of the union by the workers is not disputed. It is submitted that petitioner was in the habit of creating nuisance and he often indulged in fighting and abusing the management. He was also found to be in state of intoxication many a times. A show cause notice was issued to him even on 23-9-94. However, on the appologies tendered by the petitioner lenient view was taken and no action was taken against him.

5. Thereafter on 12-1-1995 petitioner under the state of intoxication while driving the vehicle of the management parked it wrongly in Bhawa Nagar Market. He was also found abusing and creating nuisance in the state of intoxication. He was driving the vehicle without driving licence. The vehicle was impounded by the police and the accused was taken in custody and was got medically examined. Medical examination confirmed that petitioner was under the influence of alcohol. Therefore, show cause notice was issued to the petitioner but instead of replying to the show cause notice petitioner put counter queries to the respondent.

6. It is further alleged that on 22-2-95 petitioner misbehaved with Mr. Allen Rampell, when he tried to intervene in the altercation between petitioner and one Mr. P. K. Tyagi. Petitioner allegedly pushed Mr. Allen Rampell and threatened to strike him. In this regard complaint was made in writing by Mr. Tyagi and Mr. Ken and also by Mr. Allen Rampell. Matter was enquired into by the Assistant Manager. However, the petitioner refused to give any explanation in writing. It is submitted that petitioner was put under suspension for four days, but he threatened the management that in case no decision is taken, all the work of the project will be stopped. It is submitted that petitioner refused to accept the letter of suspension from Mr. Ken and on 7-3-95 when Mr. Ken was coming to the camp, petitioner stopped his vehicle and misbehaved with him and he tried to beat him. Mr. Ken was saved by a security Guard on duty. It is submitted that on a number of occasions petitioner misbehaved with his superiors and was found under the influence of liquor and therefore, since he was on probation and he was guilty of misconduct therefore his services were terminated *vide* letter dated 8-3-95. It is submitted that the management was within its right to dismiss the petitioner from service.

7. Rejoinder was also filed where in the facts of the statement of claim have been reiterated.

8. On the pleadings of the parties, my learned predecessor framed the following issues on 8-8-96:—

1. Whether the termination of the services of the petitioner is illegal, un-lawful and contrary to the rules of natural justice, equity and fair play as alleged ?

OPP.

2. Relief.

9. Evidence was led by the parties. An application was also filed by the management to lead evidence on merit to prove the misconduct of the petitioner in case the court came to the finding that the services of the petitioner could not be terminated without legal and proper enquiry. Applicant respondent was allowed to lead evidence in the court regarding the misconduct arguments were heard.

10. *Issue No. 1.* The factum of the appointment of the petitioner as Driver and his dismissal *vide* a written order is not disputed. The submission of the learned counsel of the respondent is that as per appointment letter Ex. RA (Clause-1-2), petitioner was appointed on probation for a period of six months which could be further extended at the discretion of the management and would continue till he is confirmed. It is submitted that since no letter of confirmation was issued in favour of the petitioner, he was deemed to be on extended period of probation and as per the conditions of his appointment letter his services could be discontinued without holding any enquiry etc. Therefore, the arguments of the learned counsel of the respondent is that the petitioner was dismissed as he was not able to complete the probation period satisfactorily. His next argument is that petitioner was found guilty of misbehaving and abusing his superiors. He was also found under the influence of liquor while discharging his duties as a driver and was also arrested by the police. Medical examination proved that he was under the influence of liquor. It is also submitted that the complaints which were made by various superior officers of the petitioner are on record which prove that the petitioner was guilty of misbehaving with them and had been warned often, therefore his services were terminated on 8-3-95.

11. By moving an application under section 11-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, the respondent sought to prove the misconduct of the petitioner in the court in case it was held that no proper enquiry was conducted against the petitioner though the same was warranted.

12. The arguments of the petitioner on the other hand is that all the complaints against him have been manipulated as he was the Vice-President of the workers union. His contention regarding the incidence of 12-1-1995 while he was allegedly found under intoxication and was challenged by the police is that he was off duty and police in connivance with the management had falsely implicated him as he was indulging in union activities. It has further been submitted that all the complaints which have been placed on record are procured documents in order to victimized him for his union activities. Therefore, he is entitled to reinstatement and all other consequential benefits.

In order to prove the case, petitioner has stepped in the witness box and has relied upon the statements of two other PW's namely Shri Ravinder Kumar and Rakesh Singh. Shri Ravinder Kumar has proved the copies of certified standing orders of CFJV whereas Shri Rakesh Singh who was the President of CITU has stated on oath that some workmen had come to him with a complaint of alleged beating and misbehaviour by the police with Rajinder Singh. So he had represented to the Government against the DSP and DSP had been shifted from that place. In the cross-examination he admits that he has no documentary proof that DSP was transferred on his complaint or what action was taken in the criminal case. He has also admitted that he was not present at the spot but was told about the incident by some of the eyewitnesses. The memorandum which he has submitted has been exhibited as Ex. P-4. Shri Rajinder Singh in his statement has mentioned that he was getting Rs. 1900/- per month when his services were terminated illegally. He denied that he was not in possession of licence rather that he was given beatings by the DSP and SHO where by he fractured his rib. He claimed that he got himself medically examined on the next date but that medical certificate is not on record. He also admits that he was also got medically examined on the same day by the police and he was found having taken liquor. He however mentions that he was not driving any vehicle at that time and he was off duty since 5 p.m. whereas he had taken liquor at 7 p.m. He admits having received notice Ex. RC and the reply sent by him to this notices. He denied that he misbehaved with Mr. Ken and Allen Rampall.

13. In rebuttal respondent has examined three witnesses RW-1 is Shri Sanjiv, Clerk Incharge, District Hospital Re-kong Poo who has brought medical certificate and then Shri Sanjiv Kapoor who has exhibited this certificate Ex. RE. Third witness examined by the respondent is Shri Har Pal Singh who is Deputy General Manager (Civil) CFJV. He has mentioned that there were general complaints of drunkards and misbehaviour of the petitioner. He was served with show cause notice Ex. RB & C which he replied *vide* Ex. RD. He has also produced the copies of attendance register and salary bills of the petitioner showing that petitioner has been getting overtime payments continuously since his appointment and was performing his duties on driver. He has mentioned that he used to carry material from Badhal to Nathpa and return to Badhal on same day. Further that either way at use to take 2-3 hours on the road was the bad shape. However, on 12-1-1995 while coming from Nathpa to Badhal he stopped his vehicle at Bhawa Nagar which is seven Kms. short of Nathpa, though he was supposed to report at Badhal as he had loaded truck. He was arrested by the police on that day and the vehicle was impounded and he was got medically examined *vide* Ex. RF & G.

14. He has also stated that he was issued a show cause notice regarding the loss suffered by the company on account of the impounding of the vehicle *vide* Ex. RC, which he replied *vide* Ex. RD. Therefore, the complaints Ex. RW-3/e, f & g were received and preliminary investigation was done and report Ex. PW-3/h was submitted. He was issued suspension order which he refused to take and also threatened that workers will go on strike if suspension order is not revoked. He misbehaved with Mr. Ken on 7-3-1995 and his services were terminated on 8-3-1995 *vide* letter Ex. RW-3/l.

15. This witness admits that though the work at the project had to be completed within five six months, but it is still going on. He has mentioned that on 12-1-1995 petitioner was on duty from 8 a. m. till 8 at night and even though overtime was not mandatory but in case the worker was not to work over time he was expected to inform the management so that alternative arrangements could be made. He has denied the suggestion that these documents have been concocted to harm the interests of the petitioner.

16. Coming to the arguments of the learned counsel of the respondents that the petitioner was on probation and his dismissal was termination simplicitor on account of non-completion of probation period satisfactorily, no doubt as per the appointment letter petitioner was on the deemed extended probation and his services had not been confirmed by any ..... written communication. However the letter of dismissal which is on record and is Ex. RW-3/l reveals that his termination is stigmatic as it is mentioned that he is in habit of using abusive language to his colleagues and superiors. He has been found under the influence of liquor which is a serious misconduct as per certified standing order. The loading of this document shows that it was not a case of not having completed the probation period satisfactorily, rather petitioner was found guilty of misconduct by the management and so his termination was stigmatic and his services could not have been terminated without holding an enquiry and affording him opportunity to prove his innocence. Therefore, this arguments of the Counsel for the respondent merits rejections.

17. Now coming to the second argument that petitioner was enquired in to and petitioner refused to give any explanation in writing and so enquiry report was submitted *vide* RW-3/h also does not appear to be correct as RW-3/h is not an enquiry report but a communication sent by the Assistant Manager (Administration) enclosing the statements taken by him and the intimation of refusal of the petitioner to give any thing in writing. No proper procedure of natural justice and fair play was adhered to in this domestic enquiry. No formal charge sheet was served. The statements were not recorded in the presence of petitioner nor there was any opportunity

given to him to cross-examine these witnesses. So this documents which is being purported to be an enquiry report can not be treated as one.

18. The last argument of the Ld. Counsel is that under section 11-A of the Act the Court can hold the enquiry in to the misconduct alleged by the management and form its own opinion. There is merit in this argument as section 11-A stipulates that in case of no enquiry parties can be given opportunity to prove the misconduct and form its own opinion.

The petitioners and the respondent both have led evidence in this regard. The respondent has based his case on medical certificate Ex. RE, the letter of explanation Ex. R C, Ex. R D, Ex. RW-3/e, RW-3/f, RW-3/g, I.x, RW-3/h, RW-3/j and RW/k. The first misconduct alleged against the petitioner is that he was found under the influence of liquor while on duty and was found to have parked his vehicle on wrong side of the road. So the vehicle was impounded and accused was taken in custody. He was medically examined and was found to be under the influence of liquor. It has been alleged that due to the impounding of the vehicle company was put to huge loss as the vehicle could not be plied for 7-8 days. Therefore, this conduct of the petitioners amounts to misconduct. The submission of the petitioner on the other hand is firstly that he was not on duty as his duty hours had finished at 5 p. m. whereas he was challaned much later and that though he had taken the liquor, but he was not on duty. In this regard I may point out that though regular working hours of the petitioner came to an end at 5 p. m. but the attendance register and the salary slips which have been exhibited as RW-3/h disclose that since the date of his joining, petitioner has been regularly giving overtime so as to finish his task for the day i. e. taking the vehicle from Nathpa to Badhal and then from Badhal to Nathpa. So these documents shows that in order to complete the journey both ways petitioner was required to put overtime which he was doing regularly. It otherwise appelas to reason that in case petitioner was not interested to perform overtime he was required to attend intimate the management in advance, which he admittedly did not do. Even otherwise petitioner has not disputed that he used to take loaded truck to Nathpa and back. So petitioner could not have taken the liberty to leave the truck in between because his regular duty hours had come to an end. Therefore, for all intents and purposes the petitioner was on duty, when his vehicle was found parked on wrong side at Bhawa Nagar and he was found under intoxication.

19. Moreover the submission of the petitioner that the police was conniving with the management and he was being falsely implicated also does not seem to be correct. No doubt PW-3 has tried to establish that on this complaint authorities were satisfied that D S P was hand-in-gloves with the management and so he was transferred after this incidence, but his cross-examination, demolishes their assertion. There is no evidence to prove this fact the police was conniving with the management and had tried to falsely involve petitioner. It appears that the petitioner was challaned in a routine manner and it had nothing to do with his trade union activities. Moreover, petitioner has given different reasons for his being under the influence of liquor. While appearing in the Court he has mentioned that he took liquor at 7.00 p. m. while he was off duty, but in the medical certificate, as per the history given to the doctor he had explained that police forced him to consume liquor before bringing him for medical examination. Even the plea of the petitioner that he was given beatings by the police in the presence of the eye witnesses is not established as admittedly as P.W.-3 had no personal knowledge about the incident and has only given the statement in the Courts on the narrations given by the alleged eye witnesses whom he is not able to name. I am, therefore, of the opinion that the petitioner was found at Bhawa Nagar under intoxication while he was on duty and as a result he was taken in custody by the police and his vehicle was impounded. It is also established that the truck remained with the police for a number of days and was made non-

functional due to the wrongful act of the petitioner. This conduct of the petitioner amounts to misconduct under the certified standing order under clause 24(4).

20. The other acts of misbehaviour of the petitioner are in the form of complaints made by three of the supervisory staff, namely Mr. Allen Rampell and Mr. Ken and Mr. Tyagi. These complaints have been brought on record through Shri Harpal Singh who is the Deputy General Manager of the respondent. Respondent has however not brought any of these persons as witnesses in the court and even the signatures on these documents have not been proved specifically. The petitioner has not been afforded any opportunity of cross-examining them in the Court to prove the alleged misbehaviour with them. Therefore, the alleged misbehaviour with Mrs. Allen Rampell, Mr. Ken etc is not proved.

21. I, therefore, hold that respondent has been able to prove the misconduct viz-a-viz the incident of 12-1-95 and has not been able to prove any other misconduct against him.

22. Since the misconduct of the petitioner has led to his dismissal vide order dated 8-3-95 the next question which arises is whether the punishment is harsh and can be interfered with by this forum. As a general precedence, the sentence which is imparted is not to be interfered unless it shocks the conscience of the court and totally unreasonable and perverse. Even in case of no enquiry having been held or if enquiry is not found to be proper, the punishment cannot be interfered with except when it is harsh so as to suggest victimization. In this case since the dismissal order can not be said to be perverse or in order to victimise the petitioner, therefore, I do not see any reason to interfere with the punishment of dismissal. No doubt once the tribunal is of the view that no enquiry has been held or enquiry if held is not properly conducted, the tribunal is under obligation to hold the enquiry and take evidence from both the sides and after considering the merits of the dispute come to its own conclusion without having any regard to the view taken by the management in dismissing the employee but once the misconduct is proved either in the enquiry conducted by the employer or the evidence placed before tribunal for the first time, punishment imposed can not be interfered by the tribunal except in those cases where the punishment is very harsh. I take support from 1973 (1) S.C.C. 813 so as a result I hold that the dismissal of the petitioner is justified in view of the misconduct which has been proved in the Court.

23. I.D. representative of the petitioner has argued that if there was no enquiry conducted by the management and for the first time misconduct has been proved before the Labour Court, the order of termination/dismissal would become effective from the date of the order of the Labour Court and the workman would be entitled to the grant of full back wages from the date of his termination from service till the date of the award. He has referred to a authority 1998 (2) S.L.R. 424. This judgement has been delivered by the double bench of Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka and is reproduced below:

"Dealing with the similar circumstances and after referring to the various pronouncements of the Apex Court this Court in Abdul Gani Vs. The General Manager, Vishweshwaraiah Iron and Steel Ltd. & Ors W.A. No. 7 of 1996 C/w W.W.A. No. 4362/95-DD. 4-7-97 settled the position of law in this regard by holding that:

"While this would be the position, where there was a domestic enquiry which was found defective and the justification made in the Labour Court, herein, in the present case the service of the workman had been terminated without there being an enquiry. It was for the first time before the Labour Court that the employer, on leading evidence, justified the termination of services of the workman. Such a case ought to be covered by the principle enunciated in

Sasa Musa Sugar Works (P) Ltd. case. As earlier noted the constitution Bench in Kalyani, while referring to the relevant observations in Sasa Musa Sugar Works (P) Ltd., pointed out as to how there had been no previous enquiry whatsoever that had been held by the employer, and as to how the case for dismissal had been made out for the first time in the proceeding under Section 33 before the Labour Court. It was in those circumstances that the Constitution Bench noted that the employees in Sasa Musa Sugar Work (P) Ltd. would be entitled to their wages till the decision on the application under Section 33 I. e. till the decision by the Labour Court while making this distinction, the Constitution Bench in Kalyani also observed that the matter would have been different, if, in that case, an enquiry had been held, and the employer had to come to the conclusion that the dismissal was the proper punishment and had thereafter applied for permission under Section 33 (1). The Constitution Bench observed that in those circumstances, that permission would have related back to the date when the employer came to the conclusion after an enquiry, that the dismissal was the proper punishment and had applied for the removal of the ban by an application under section 33 (1). In other words, if circumstances similar to Sasa Musa Sugar Works (P) Ltd. existed I. e. if the order of termination is without an enquiry as in the present case, then, until termination is justified before the Labour Court culminating in the award of the Labour Court, the workman concerned would be entitled to wage. This is the position duly recognised in Kalyani and D. C. Roy also, when the circumstances relating to Sasa Musa Sugar Works (P) Ltd., were distinctly set out and Sasa Musa Sugar Works (P), Ltd., was distinguished.

In view of what has been discussed above, it is held that (1) in case where a defective enquiry is held before termination of services of the workman, the management has a right to justify their action by leading evidence before the Labour Court under the Act. In such a case if the action of the management is upheld the order of dismissal would relate back to the date when it was actually passed by the management, but (2) in case where the order of dismissal is passed without holding any enquiry and the action is justified by the management before the Labour Court after adducing evidence the order of dismissal would become effective from the date of the order of the Labour Court, and in that event the workman would be entitled to the grant of full back wages from the date of termination of his services till the date of award of the Labour Court,

Such a position of law is consonance with the principles of natural justice and the objects sought to be achieved by the Industrial Laws enacted for protecting the interest of the workman. In the absence of an enquiry as mandated under the Act, Rules, Bye-laws and Standing Orders governing the service conditions of the workman the order of dismissal should be deemed to be non-existent and not operating against the interest of the workman till it is justified in a legal manner by adducing evidence before the Labour Court, in as much as the workman dismissed in complete disregard to the principles of law and awaiting verdict of the Court would be deprived of the wages even for the period he awaits a judgment. The position in the case of defective enquiry would be totally different because the workman in that case would take a chance to prove that the enquiry though held was defective but in a case where no enquiry was held he would be justified to presume that the action of the respondent was liable to be quashed being contrary

to law. For the fault and inaction of the management and in the hope of seeking justice the workman could not be deprived of the wages for the period he remains out of job and employment presumably on account of the pendency of the case in a Court of law".

24. The crux of this judgment is that when a defective enquiry is held before termination of the service of a workman, management has a right to justify their action before the Court by ledging evidence. If the action of the management is upheld, the order will be effective from the date when it was actually passed by the management, but where the order of termination is made without holding any enquiry and the action is justified by the management before the Labour Court after adducing evidence, the order of termination/dismissal would become effective only from the date of the order of the Labour Court and in that event, the workman would be entitled to the grant of full back wages from the date of termination of service till the date of the award of the Labour Court. Now coming to this conclusion. Hon'ble the Karnataka High Court has relied upon the decision of the Apex Court in *Abdul Gianni v/s The General Manager, Vishwashwarajah Iron and Steel Ltd., & Ors.*

In the present case, no enquiry has been held into the misconduct by the employer and enquiry was held for the first time during the proceedings before the Labour Court. Therefore, in this case, the order of termination/dismissal would become effective from the date of orders of the Labour Court and he will be entitled to the full back wages from the date of his termination till the award of this Court. I, therefore, hold that though the petitioner is liable to be dismissed from service on account of his misconduct, but he is entitled to full back wages from the date of his termination i.e. w.e.f. 8-3-1995 till the date of the award i.e. 31-3-2001. I, therefore, decide this issue accordingly.

#### RELIEF

25. Keeping in view the aforesaid findings and discussion, I hold that the petitioner is liable to be dismissed from service on account of his misconduct, but he is entitled to full back wages from the date of his termination i.e. w.e.f. 8-3-1995 till the date of award i.e. 31-3-2001. The reference is answered accordingly. Let a copy of this award be sent to the appropriate Government for its publication in the Himachal Pradesh Rajpatra in accordance with Law.

Announced in the Open Court today this 31st Day of March, 2001.

Seal.

ARUNA KAPOOR  
Presiding Judge,  
H.P. Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Shimla.

#### PLANNING DEPARTMENT

#### NOTIFICATIONS

Mandi, the 31st January, 2001

No. PLG (F) (R & D) 4-5/98.—In continuation of Himachal Pradesh Government notification No. PLG (F) (R & D) 4-5/95 dated the 31st March, 1998, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to notify the following as Non-Official Members of the Sub-Divisional Level Public Grievances Redressal, Planning, Development and 20 point Programme Review Committee of Jogindernagar Sub Division in Mandi District :—

*Jogindernagar Sub-Division:*

1. Shri Ganga Ram Jamwal, P. O. and Tehsil Jogindernagar, District Mandi.

2. Shri Ramesh Sharma, Mandal President BJP, V.P.O. Nagwain, Sub-Tehsil Aut, District Mandi.
3. Smt. Hema Thakur, Member BJP State Executive, V.P.O. Majharnoo, District Mandi.
4. Shri Tek Chand Mandyal, Mandal President BJP, Village, Jinjima P. O. and Tehsil Jogindernagar, District Mandi.
5. Smt. Kunti Devi, President Mahila Morcha, Village Jhajwan P. O. Jalpehar, Tehsil Jogindernagar, District Mandi.
6. Shri Kehar Singh, Ex-Pradhan, V.P.O. Sunus, Tehsil Jogindernagar, District Mandi.
7. Shri Sant Ram, General Secretary BJP, V.P.O. Chuku, Tehsil Jogindernagar, District Mandi.
8. Shri Hem Raj, Up Pradhan, GP Gummia, P.O. Gummia, Tehsil Jogindernagar, District Mandi.
9. Shri Roop Singh Thakur, Vice-President BJP, Village Ciora, Tehsil Ladbharol, District Mandi.
10. Shri Lalit Rana, Ex-Pradhan, V.P.O. Drubbal, Tehsil Jogindernagar, District Mandi.
11. Shri Mani Ram Verma, Member Zila Parishad, V.P.O. Chauntra, Tehsil Jogindernagar, District Mandi.
12. Shri Bhagmal, Member Zila Parishad, Village Nagan, P. O. Bath-Kuar Via Ladbharol, Tehsil Ladbharol, District Mandi.
13. Shri Karam Chand, Ex-Pradhan, V.P.O. Dhela, Tehsil Jogindernagar, District Mandi.
14. Shri Ramesh Sood, President Beopar Mandal, Jodhpur, District Mandi.
15. Shri Khem Singh Pradhan, GP Urta, Tehsil Padhar, District Mandi.
16. Shri Devi Singh Thakur, Ex-Pradhan, V.P.O. Drubbal, Tehsil Jodhpur, District Mandi.
17. Smt. Parwati Devi Chairman BDC, Drang Block, Tehsil Padhar, District Mandi.
18. Shri Harnam Singh, Chairman BDC, Chauntra, Tehsil Jodhpur, District Mandi.
19. Shri Kahan Chand, V.P.O. Thajukhod, Tehsil Padhar, District Mandi.
20. Shri Satish Thakur, President, GP Manan-Bhandar, Tehsil Ladbharol, District Mandi.
21. Shri Renu Singh, Village Pali, P.O. Kunnu, Tehsil Padhar, District Mandi.
22. Smt. Sushila Sharma, Up-Pradhan, V.P.O. Ladruhin, Tehsil Jodhpur, District Mandi.
23. Sh. Om Marwah, General Secretary, BJP, Jodhpur, District Mandi.
24. Shri Ajay Siklani, General Secretary BJP Youth, Tehsil Jodhpur, District Mandi.
25. Shri Sambal Chand Verma, President, Ex-Serviceman, Association and Pradhan, V.P.O. Balakrupa, Tehsil Jodhpur, District Mandi.

*Shimla-2, the 7th February, 2001*

No. PLG (F) (R & D) 1-1/99.—In partial modification of this department's notification of even number dated the 14th January, 2000, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to nominate the following as

Chairman of District Level Planning Development and 20 Point Programme Review Committees with immediate effect.

Sl. No.	Name of the District	Name of the Chairman
1.	Bilaspur	Shri Rikhi Ram Kaundal MOS (Co-op.).
2.	Chamba	Shri Mohan Lal, MOS (Ayurveda).
3.	Hamirpur	Smt. Urmil Thakur, Parliamentary Secretary.
4.	Kangra	Chaudhary Vidya Sagar, Agri. Minister.
5.	Kullu	Shri Parkash Chaudhary, MOS (RD).
6.	Kinnaur	Shri Ramesh Chaudhary, I & PH Minister.
7.	Mandi	Shri Roop Singh Thakur, Forest Minister.
8.	Lahaut & Spiti	Shri Ram Lal Markonde, MOS (AH).
9.	Shimla	Shri Narendra Bragta, MOS (Hort.).
10.	Sirmaur	Shri Gulab Singh Thakur, Speaker, Vidhan Sabha,
11.	Solan	Shri Mansa Ram, Welfare Minister.
12.	Una	Shri Ram Dass Malangat, Dy. Speaker, Vidhan Sabha.

Shimla-2, the 20th March, 2001

No. PLG F. C. (F) 3-3/98.—Consequent upon the nomination of the following persons as non-official members of the State Planning Board, Himachal Pradesh vide notification of even No. dated 12th January, 2001 the Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to declare that these non-official members would be entitled to travel by any mode of transport for the journeys to be performed in connection with the meeting of State Planning Board in Himachal Pradesh or any other Sub-Group constituted thereunder in relaxation of the TA rules and conditions governing the entitlements of TA and DA to non-official members circulated by the Finance Department from time to time.

The Governor is further pleased to declare that all the following non-official members of the State Planning Board would be declared as State Guests for their stay in Himachal Pradesh in connection with the meeting of State Planning Board or any other Sub-Group.

1. Dr. Amrita Patel, Chairperson, National Dairy Development Board, Post Box No. 40 Anand-388001, Gujarat.
2. Dr. Manju Sharma, Secretary, Ministry of Science & Technology, Department of Biotechnology, Government of India, Block-2 (7th floor) C G O Complex Lodhi Road, New Delhi-110003.
3. Shri Dewang Mehta, President, NASSCOM, International Youth Centre, Teen Murti Marg, Chanakyapuri, New Delhi-110021.

4. Dr. N. Vijayaditya, Acting Director General, National Informatic Centre, A-Block CGO Complex, Lodhi Road, New Delhi-110003.

5. Shri Harbans Singh Retd., Commissioner of Horticulture, Government of India, C-8, 8221, Vasant Kunj, New Delhi-110070.

The Governor is also pleased to declare the pr. Advisor-cum-Secy. (Planning) as the controlling officer in regard to the countersigning of TA bills of the non-official members of the State Planning Board.

By order,

ASIA SWAROOP,  
Financial Commissioner.

राजस्व विभाग  
(प्रोसेक्ट सेन)

विधिसचिवाल

शिमला-2, 27 जून, 2001

संचय रेव (पी० डी०) ए० (4)-१/९९—इस विभाग की समसंचया अधिसचिवा दिनांक १-६-१९९९ की नियंत्रण में राज्यपाल हिमाचल प्रदेश, जिला स्तरीय भाष्यका बोध विस्तापित पुनरावृत्ति एवं सलाहकार समिति की उपायुक्त विलासपुर की अध्यक्षता में दो बूँद की अवधि के लिए गठित करने के सहर्ष आदेश देते हैं जिसका उद्देश्य भाष्यका बोध के निर्माण से विस्तापित हो, अवित्तियों के पुनर्वापि व अन्य समस्याओं की देख-रेख करना है। इस समिति में निम्नलिखित गैर-सरकारी एवं सरकारी सदस्य होंगे,—

1. उपायुक्त विलासपुर, हिमाचल प्रदेश अध्यक्ष
2. श्री क० डी० घरणी, पूर्व विधायक व उपाध्यक्ष २०-स्क्रीन कार्यक्रम गैर-सरकारी सदस्य
3. श्री सदा राम ठाकुर, पूर्व विधायक, गांव बैहल बन्डीला, डा० विलासपुर। "
4. श्री मस्त राम ठाकुर, पूर्व विधायक, गांव बाषु, डा० बिनोला, तहसील सदर, विलासपुर। "
5. कैप्टन जिन्दू राम (से० नि०), गांव व डा० कन्दरौर, जिला विलासपुर। "
6. श्री कुलदीप चन्देल, जनसत्ता संबाददाता, राजा नैस्टर, विलासपुर। "
7. श्री व्यार सिंह ठाकुर, गांव बढ़यात, डा० व जिला विलासपुर (हि० प्र०)। "
8. श्री किशन सिंह चन्देल, गांव धरेड़, डा० अधिकोण, जिला विलासपुर (हि० प्र०)। "
9. श्री मुधीर कुरेशी, पत्रकार, विलासपुर (हि० प्र०) "
10. श्री मनसी राम संल्यान, बांस्के-डाईंग, मेल बाजार विलासपुर (हि० प्र०)। "
11. श्री प्रकाश चन्देल, गांव व डा० भाष्यका जिला विलासपुर (हि० प्र०)। "
12. श्रीमती कमला संघ, सदस्य, जिला परिषद, गांव दरियाना, डा० आहोर, जिला विलासपुर। "
13. श्री राजेण बर्मा, गांव तरकेड, डा० चांदपुर, जिला विलासपुर (हि० प्र०)। "
14. डा० अश्वनी डोगरा, इन्हिंट्रियल एन्जिनियर विलासपुर (हि० प्र०)। "

15. श्री हरदयाल चिंह, गांव य डा० समोह, तहसील गैर सरकारी शास्त्रज्ञता, जिला विलासपुर (हि० प्र०) ।	सदस्य	7. श्री राम लाल ठाकुर, विधायक	गैर-सरकारी सदस्य
16. अनिरिक्त जिला दण्डाधिकारी, जिला सपुर अरकारी सदस्य		8. श्री गंग दाम मनांगड़, उपाध्यक्ष, विधान सभा, हिमाचल प्रदेश ।	"
17. अधिगारी अभियन्ता, लोक निर्माण विभाग " विलासपुर (हि० प्र०) ।		9. श्री सुभार ठाकुर, गांव वागर, डा० निचली बटेड़, तहसील सदर, जिला विलासपुर, हिमाचल प्रदेश ।	"
18. अधिगारी अभियन्ता, मिचाई एवं जन-स्वास्थ्य विलासपुर (हि० प्र०) ।	"	10. श्री जगत गम प्रधान, ग्राम पंचायत श्रीहर, नह० चुमारवी, जिला विलासपुर, हिमाचल प्रदेश ।	"
19. अधिगारी अभियन्ता, हि० प्र० राज्य विषय बोर्ड विलासपुर (हि० प्र०) ।	"	11. श्री के० के० कौणल, पूर्व विधायक	"
20. अरण्यपाल विलासपुर	"	12. श्री जय कुमार, पत्रकार एवं महा चैत्र, मालवड़ा बांध विस्थापित मंथ विलासपुर, हिमाचल प्रदेश ।	"
21. उप-मण्डलाधिकारी (ना०), विलासपुर ।	"	13. मंत्री निव गम, विलासपुर	"
22. उप-मण्डलाधिकारी (ना०) अमारवी	"	14. श्री बद्रित मिह ठाकुर, बंगाणा जिला कला, हिमाचल प्रदेश ।	"
23. योजना अधिकारी, उप-मण्डल नगर एवं ग्राम योजना, विलासपुर (हि० प्र०) ।	"	15. श्री रणदीर शर्मा, उपाध्यक्ष, नव चैत्र मनाहकार बोड़, हिमाचल प्रदेश ।	"
24. उपरोक्त विलासपुर के सहायक आयुक्त	सदस्य-मन्त्रिव	16. श्री गृ० गृ० अटवाल (गृ० नि०) ए० ए० ए० गृ०, गांव मनारी, नह० चारांगाट, जिला विलासपुर ।	"
उपरोक्त सदस्यों के अतिरिक्त राज्य स्तरीय भाष्वड़ा बांध विस्थापित पुनर्वास एवं सलाहकार समिति के जिला से सम्बन्ध रखने वाले गैर-सरकारी सदस्य जिला स्तर की समिति में विशेष आमन्त्रित सदस्य होंगे ।		17. जिलायाकृत-एवं-काचित (ग्रजम्ब)	गैर-सरकारी-सदस्य
2. सरकारी सदस्य उन पर लागू भत्ता नियमानुसार नेने के हकदार होंगे ।		18. मन्त्रिव, लोक निर्माण विभाग	"
3. उपरोक्त समिति के गैर-सरकारी सदस्य समिति से सम्बन्धित कार्य के लिए की गई यात्रा/माईलेज/दिनिक भत्ता नेने के हकदार होंगे जैसा कि अनुवन्ध में दर्शाया गया है ।		19. मन्त्रिव, मिचाई एवं जन-स्वास्थ्य विभाग	"
4. गैर-सरकारी सदस्यों के बाजा भत्ता तथा वैनिक भत्तों का छव्वा भूल्य शीर्ष "2053—जिला प्रशासन—093—जिला स्थापना—01—सामाजिक स्थापना देय होगा ।		20. अध्यक्ष, बी० बी० ए० बी० बी०, अड्डोगढ़ ।	"
5. जिलाधीश विलासपुर गैर-सरकारी सदस्यों के यात्रा भत्ता बिलों के नियन्त्रक अधिकारी होंगे तथा यात्रा भत्ता भत्ता बिलों पर प्रतिहस्तानकर करें ।		21. अधीक्षण अभियन्ता, भाष्वड़ा बांध परियोजना तलबाड़ा, पंजाब ।	"
शिमला-2, 23 जून, 2001		22. प्रमुख अभियन्ता, लोक निर्माण विभाग मिचाई एवं जन-स्वास्थ्य विभाग ।	"
संख्या रेक (पीडी (9)-3/81.—इस विभाग की समसंबंधिक अधिसूचना दिनांक 26-4-1999 की निरन्तरता में राज्यपाल, हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य स्तरीय भाष्वड़ा बांध विस्थापित पुनर्वास एवं सलाहकार समिति को दो वर्ष की अवधि के लिये गठित करने के महर्य आदेश देते हैं । जिसका उद्देश्य भाष्वड़ा बांध विस्थापित सलाहकार समिति के निर्माण से विस्थापित हुवे व्यक्तियों के पुनर्वास व अन्य समस्याओं की देख-रेख करना है । इस समिति में निम्नलिखित गैर-सरकारी एवं सरकारी सदस्य होंगे—		23. मुख्य अभियन्ता, लोक निर्माण विभाग	"
1. मुख्य मन्त्री, हिमाचल प्रदेश	प्रब्लेम	24. मुख्य अभियन्ता, मिचाई गृ० जन-स्वास्थ्य विभाग ।	"
2. राज्य मन्त्री राजस्व, हिमाचल प्रदेश	उपाध्यक्ष	25. मण्डलायुक्त, मण्डो मण्डल, मण्डी, जिला मण्डी ।	"
3. स्वास्थ्य एवं परिवार कल्याण मन्त्री हिमाचल प्रदेश	सदस्य	26. जिलाधीश विलासपुर	"
4. राज्य मन्त्री सहकारिता, हिमाचल प्रदेश	सदस्य	27. अधिगारी अभियन्ता (लो० नि० वि०) विलासपुर ।	"
5. श्री सुरेश चन्द्रेन, संसद सदस्य	गैर-सरकारी नदस्य	28. अधिगारी अभियन्ता हि० प्र० राज्य विजली बोर्ड, विलासपुर ।	"
6. श्री कश्मीर मिह ठाकुर, विधायक	"	29. संयुक्त मन्त्रिव (शाजम्ब)	मदस्य-मन्त्रिव

सरकारी सदस्य उन पर लागू/यात्रा भत्ता नियमानुसार नेने के हकदार होंगे । उपरोक्त समिति के गैर-सरकारी सदस्य समिति से सम्बन्धित कार्य के लिए की गई यात्रा/माईलेज/दिनिक भत्ता नेने के हकदार होंगे जैसा कि अनुवन्ध में दर्शाया गया है ।

अतिरिक्त सचिव/अवर सचिव, सचिवालय प्रशासन-लेखा, हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार गैर-सरकारी सदस्यों के नियन्त्रक अधिकारी होंगे तथा उनके याता भत्ता बिलों को बनायेंगे तथा इसका खर्च मुच्य शीर्ष 20.52- सचिवालय सामान्य सेवायें-0.9-सचिवालय-0.1 मुच्य सचिवालय याता भत्ता खर्च से देय होगा ।

आदेश द्वारा,

हस्ताक्षरित/-  
वित्तायुक्त एवं सचिव (राजस्व) ।

यामीण विकास विभाग

अधिसूचना

शिमला-9, 7 जुलाई, 2001

संख्या आरा० डी० डी०-१-बी (15) 118/४९-III-राज्यपाल, हिमाचल प्रदेश यामीण विकास विभाग में कनिष्ठ अधियन्ताओं के 47 पदों को (जिनका विवरण नीचे दिया गया है) तत्काल प्रभाव से समाप्त करने के सहृद आदेश प्रदान करते हैं:—

47

हस्ताक्षरित/-  
आयुक्त एवं सचिव ।

क्र.0	विकास द्वारा कार्यालय का नाम जहां	समाप्त किए जाने
सं.0	कनिष्ठ अधियन्ता का पद समाप्त	वाले पदों की
1	किया गया	संख्या
2		3
1.	आरनी	1
2.	वंजार	1
3.	निरमण	1
4.	काजा	1
5.	केलांग	1
6.	धर्मपुर सोलन	1
7.	सोलन	1
8.	सलूणी	2
9.	तीसा	2
10.	भरमोर	1
11.	भटियात	1
12.	चम्बा	1
13.	मैहला	1
14.	पांगी	2
15.	निचार	1
16.	कल्पा	1
17.	पूर्व	1
18.	पच्छाद	1
19.	शिलाई	1
20.	राजगढ़	1
21.	पावटा	1
22.	संगड़ाह	2
23.	चौपात	2
24.	रोहड़	2
25.	ठिपोल	1
		2

भाग-2—वैदानिक नियमों को छोड़कर विभिन्न विभागों के अध्यक्षों और जिला भैंसिस्ट्रॉटों द्वारा अधिसूचनाएं हस्ताक्षित कार्यालय नियम विभाग के पंजीयक, सहकारी समाएं, चम्बा, जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश

कार्यालय अधिदेश

वैदानिक विभाग, सहकारी समाएं, चम्बा, जिला चम्बा, उक्त सहकारी समा के विघटक की रिपोर्ट को दर्पणान रखने हुए हिमाचल प्रदेश सहकारी समाएं अधिनियम, 1968 (रिक्ट नं० ३ आफ 1969) की बारा ४३ (२) के अन्तर्गत तीसा ऊ उत्तादक प्रायमिक विपणन सहकारी समा सीमित तीसा के पंजीयन को रद्द करने की

रिपोर्ट में उक्त सहकारी समा के पंजीयन को रद्द करने की सिफारिश की है।

चम्बा, 26 जून, 2001

संख्या 2330-36.—चूंकि तीसा ऊ उत्तादक प्रायमिक विपणन सहकारी समा सीमित तीसा को इस कार्यालय के आदेश संख्या 1072-80 दिनांक 1-6-2000 के द्वारा विघटन में डाला गया था।

चूंकि विघटक द्वारा समा के प्राप्तव्य व दायित्वों को समाप्त करके अवशेष पत्र को शन्य किया जा चुका है तथा इसके पुनर्जीवित होने की कोई भी मम्मावना नहीं है।

1	2	3
26.	नारकण्डा	1
27.	रामपुर	1
28.	बड़गाँव	1
29.	जुब्बल	2
30.	बसन्तपुर	1
31.	अम्ब	1
32.	गगरेट	1
33.	हरोली	1
34.	ऊना	1
35.	करसोग	1
36.	धर्मपुर मण्डी	1
37.	मुलह	1
38.	कतेहपुर	1
39.	राज्य मुच्यालय शिमला	1

नगर एवं ग्राम योजना विभाग

शुद्धि पत्र

25 जून, 2001

संख्या टी० सी० पी०-एफ(6)-1/99.—इस विभाग द्वारा जारी समसंबंधीक अधिसूचना दिनांक 22-1-2001 में उदयपुर विशेष क्षेत्र विकास प्राधिकरण के गठन में कम संख्या 9 पर तहसीलदार उदयपुर के स्थान पर नावव तहसीलदार उदयपुर, सदस्य सचिव पढ़ा जाए।

आदेश द्वारा,

हस्ताक्षरित/-

आयुक्त एवं सचिव ।

## SOCIAL AND WOMEN'S WELFARE DEPARTMENT

### CORRIGENDUM

Shimla-2, the 26th June, 2001

No. Kalyan-CH(10)13/2000.—Please read rename "SWAYAMSIDHA" (IWEП) instead of Integrated Women's Empowerment Programme of this department notification of even number dated 28th May, 2001.

By order,

Sd/-  
Commissioner-cum-Secretary,

अतः मैं, विवेक महाजन, सहायक पंजीयक, सहकारी समाएं चम्बा, जिला चम्बा, उक्त सहकारी समा के विघटक की रिपोर्ट को दर्पणान रखने हुए हिमाचल प्रदेश सहकारी समाएं अधिनियम, 1968 (रिक्ट नं० ३ आफ 1969) की बारा ४३ (२) के अन्तर्गत तीसा ऊ उत्तादक प्रायमिक विपणन सहकारी समा सीमित तीसा के पंजीयन को रद्द करने की

विवेक महाजन,  
सहायक पंजीयक, सहकारी समाएं,  
चम्बा, जिला चम्बा (हि० प्र०)।

कार्यालय जिला पंचायत अधिकारी, जिला किल्नोर इकाई कार्यालय, हिमाचल प्रदेश कार्यालय आदेश रिकांगीओ, 7 जुलाई, 2001

संघ्या कनर-पंच (निर्वाचन) 775/95-2329.—श्री गुलाब चन्द

सदस्य, ग्राम पंचायत चान्सू, विकास खण्ड कल्पा ने अपने पद से त्याग-पत्र दिया है जो कि विकास खण्ड अधिकारी कल्पा ने अपने कार्यालय पत्र संख्या के ० डी० बी० (पंच) (नि०) 2000-362, दिनांक 30-3-2001 को अपनी सिफारिश सहित स्वीकृति हेतु भेजा है।

अतः मैं, धर्मवीर, जिला पंचायत अधिकारी, जिला किल्नोर, हिमाचल प्रदेश (पंचायती राज अधिनियम, 1994 की धारा 130) तथा नियमावली 1997 के नियम 135 (2) उप-नियम (1) में प्राप्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, श्री गुलाब चन्द सदस्य, वार्ड नं० 5 का त्याग-पत्र तत्काल प्रभाव से स्वीकृत करता हूँ।

रिकांगीओ, 7 जुलाई, 2001

संघ्या कनर-पंच (निर्वाचन) 775/95-2324.—श्री देव कुण्ड सदस्य, ग्राम पंचायत कल्पा, विकास खण्ड कल्पा ने अपने पद से त्याग-पत्र दिया है जो कि विकास खण्ड अधिकारी कल्पा ने अपने कार्यालय पत्र संख्या के ० डी० बी० (पंच) (नि०) 2000-362, दिनांक 30-3-2001 को अपनी सिफारिश सहित स्वीकृति हेतु भेजा है।

अतः मैं, धर्मवीर, जिला पंचायत अधिकारी, जिला किल्नोर, हिमाचल प्रदेश (पंचायती राज अधिनियम, 1994 की धारा 130) तथा नियमावली 1997 के नियम 135 (2) उप-नियम (1) में प्राप्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, श्री देव कुण्ड, सदस्य, वार्ड नं० 5 का त्याग-पत्र तत्काल से स्वीकृत करता हूँ।

रिकांगीओ, 7 जुलाई, 2001

संघ्या कनर-पंच (निर्वाचन) 775/95-2319.—श्रीमती गुरुकुमपति, सदस्य, ग्राम पंचायत रोधी, विकास खण्ड कल्पा ने अपने पद से त्याग-पत्र दिया है जो कि विकास खण्ड अधिकारी, कल्पा ने अपने कार्यालय पत्र संख्या के ० डी० बी० (पंच) (नि०) 2000-362, दिनांक 30-3-2001 को अपनी सिफारिश सहित स्वीकृति हेतु भेजा है।

अतः मैं, धर्मवीर, जिला पंचायत अधिकारी, जिला किल्नोर, हिमाचल प्रदेश (पंचायती राज अधिनियम, 1994 की धारा 130) तथा नियमावली 1997 के नियम 135 (2) उप-नियम (1) में प्राप्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, श्रीमती गुरुकुमपति, सदस्य, वार्ड नं० 1 का त्याग-पत्र तत्काल प्रभाव से स्वीकृत करता हूँ।

रिकांगीओ, 7 जुलाई, 2001

संघ्या कनर-पंच (निर्वाचन) 775/95-2314.—श्रीमती भजन कुमारी, सदस्य, ग्राम पंचायत चान्सू, विकास खण्ड कल्पा ने अपने पद से त्याग-पत्र दिया है जो कि विकास खण्ड अधिकारी, कल्पा ने अपने कार्यालय पत्र संख्या के ० डी० बी० (पंच) (नि०) 2000-362, दिनांक 30-3-2001 को अपनी सिफारिश सहित स्वीकृति हेतु भेजा है।

भाग-3—अधिनियम, विवेक और विश्वेषणों पर प्रबल समिति के प्रतिबेन, वेत्तानिक नियम तथा हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल, हिमाचल प्रदेश हाई कोर्ट, काईनंशियल कमिशनर तथा कमिशनर लॉफ इंजिनियर द्वारा अधिसंचित आदेश इथादि

मत्स्य पालन विभाग

अधिसूचना

शिमला-171002, 22 मई, 2001

संघ्या फिश-ए (3)-3/2001.—हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल, भारत के संविधान के अनुच्छेद 309 के परन्तुक द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए हिमाचल प्रदेश लोक सेवा आयोग के परामर्श से,

अतः मैं, धर्मवीर, जिला पंचायत अधिकारी, जिला किल्नोर, हिमाचल प्रदेश (पंचायती राज अधिनियम, 1994 की धारा 130) तथा नियमावली 1997 के नियम 135 (2) उप-नियम (1) में प्राप्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, श्रीमती भजन कुमारी, सदस्य, वार्ड नं० 4 का त्याग-पत्र तत्काल प्रभाव से स्वीकृत करता है।

हस्ताक्षरित—

जिला पंचायत अधिकारी,  
रिकांगीओ, जिला किल्नोर,  
हिमाचल प्रदेश।

## TOURISM DEPARTMENT

### CANCELLATION ORDER OF HOTELS

Shimla-9, the 6th July, 2001

No. 11-3/94-DTO/SML-3541.—Whereas "Tripti Tours and Travels" The Mall Shimla, H. P. is registered vide registration certificate No. 11-3/94-DTO-SML 2079 dated 10-6-94 under the Himachal Pradesh Registration of Tourist Trade Act, 1988.

Whereas the proprietor of the above Travel Agent vide his application dated Nil has requested to cancel its certificate of registration since he has cease to operate the above travel agency.

Therefore, I, Surinder Justa, District Tourism Development Officer, Shimla division, Shimla in exercise of the power vested in me under section 13 (a) of Himachal Pradesh Registration of Tourist Trade Act, 1988, hereby order to remove the name of the Travel Agency known as Tripti Tours and Travels the Mall Shimla from the register and cancel its certificate of Registration with immediate effect.

Shimla-9, the 6th July, 2001

No. 13-25/75 DTO/SML-3538.—Whereas "Vijay" Hotel Shimla-1, District Shimla, H. P. is registered vide registration certificate No. Nil dated, 31-12-1975 under the Himachal Pradesh Registration of Hotel and Travel Agents Act, 1969.

Whereas the proprietor of the above hotel vide his application dated 26-6-2001 has requested to cancel its certificate of registration since he has cease to operate the aforesaid hotel with immediate effect.

Therefore, I, Surinder Justa, District Tourism Development Officer, Shimla, Division Shimla in exercise of the powers vested in me under section 13 (a) of Himachal Pradesh Registration of Tourist Trade Act, 1988, hereby order to remove the name of the hotel known as Vijay at Shimla-1, District Shimla, H. P. from the register and cancel its certificate of Registration with immediate effect.

Sd/-  
District Tourism Dev. Officer,  
Shimla Division, Shimla.  
SDA Complex, Block No. 28,  
Kasumpi, Shimla-171009.

इस विभाग की अधिसूचना संख्या फिश-ए (1)-1/93 तारीख 18-6-1996, द्वारा अधिसूचित, हिमाचल प्रदेश मत्स्य पालन विभाग में निवेशक एवं वार्डन (मत्स्य) वर्ग-1 (राजपत्रित) के पद के भर्ती एवं प्रोन्ति नियम, 1996 में संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाये हैं, वर्ग-1:

1. संविधान नाम और प्रारम्भ—(i) इन नियमों का संविधान नाम हिमाचल प्रदेश मत्स्य पालन विभाग, निवेशक एवं वार्डन मत्स्य, वर्ग-1 (राजपत्रित), भर्ती एवं प्रोन्ति नियम (प्रथम संशोधन) नियम, 2001 है।

(ii) ये नियम राजपत्र, हिमाचल प्रदेश में प्रकाशित किये जाने की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. उपावन्ध-1 का संशोधन।—हिमाचल प्रदेश मत्स्य पालन विभाग नियन्त्रक एवं वाईन मत्स्य, वर्ग-I (राजपत्रित) भर्ती एवं प्रोन्ति नियन्त्रक, 1996 के उपावन्ध-1 में—

(क) स्थान संख्या 4 के सामने विचारान उपचारकों के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित प्रतिस्थापित किए जाएंगे, अर्थात्:—

“14300-400-15900-450-18600 रुपए”

(ख) स्थान संख्या 14 के सामने विचारान उपचारकों के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित प्रतिस्थापित किए जाएंगे, अर्थात्:—

“किसी सेवा या पद पर नियमित के लिए भार्या का भारत का नागरिक होना आवश्यक है”

आवेदन द्वारा,

हस्ताक्षरित/-  
वित्तायुक्त एवं सचिव।

(Authoritative English text of notification No. Fish-A (3)-3/2001 dated 22-5-2001 as required under clause (3) of Article 348 of the Constitution of India).

#### FISHERIES DEPARTMENT

#### NOTIFICATION

Shimla-2, the 22nd May, 2001

No. Fish-A (3)-3/2001.—In exercise of the powers conferred by proviso to Article 309 of the Constitution of India, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh in consultation with the Himachal Pradesh Public Service Commission is pleased to amend the R. & P. Rules for the post of Director-cum-Warden of Fisheries (Class-I-Gazetted) in the Department of Fisheries, Himachal Pradesh notified vide this department notification No. Fish-Kha(1)-1/93 dated the 18th June, 1996 namely:—

1. *Short title and commencement.*—(1) These rules may be called the Himachal Pradesh Department of Fisheries, Director-cum-Warden of Fisheries (Class-I-Gazetted) R. & P. (First Amendment) Rules, 2001.

(2) These rules shall come into force from the date of their publication in the Rajpatra, Himachal Pradesh.

2. *Amendment of Annexure-I.*—In Annexure-I to the Himachal Pradesh Fisheries Department, Director-cum-Warden of Fisheries (Class-I-Gazetted) R. & P. Rules, 1996.—

(a) For the existing provisions against Column No. 4 the following shall be substituted, namely:—  
“Rs. 14300-400-15900-450-18600”

(b) For the existing provisions against Column No. 14, the following shall be substituted, namely:—

“A candidate for appointment to any service or post must be a Citizen of India”.

By order,

Sd/-  
F. C.-cum-Secretary.

#### GENERAL ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALITY AND PROTOCOL DEPARTMENT

#### NOTIFICATION

Shimla-2, the 31st January, 2001

No. Hosp.-A(1)-9/99-137.—In exercise of the powers conferred by the proviso to Article 309 of the Constitution

of India, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh, in consultation with the H. P. Public Service Commission is pleased to make the Recruitment and Promotion Rules for the post of Clerk Class-III (Non-Gazetted) in the Hospitality and Protocol Department, as per Annexure-I attached to this notification, namely:—

1. *Short title and commencement.*—(1) These rules shall be called the Himachal Pradesh Hospitality and Protocol Department, Clerk, Class-III (Non-Gazetted) Recruitment and Promotion Rules, 2001.

(2). These rules shall come into force from the date of publication of this notification in the Rajpatra, Himachal Pradesh.

2. *Rules.*—The number of post (s) classification, pay scale, qualification and method of recruitment etc. for the post of clerk in the Hospitality and Protocol Department shall be as specified in Annexure 'I' to this notification.

By order,  
Sd/-  
Commissioner-cum-Secretary (GAD).

#### ANNEXURE-“A”

#### RECRUITMENT AND PROMOTION RULES FOR THE POST OF CLERK CLASS-III (NON-GAZETTED) IN THE HOSPITALITY AND PROTOCOL DEPARTMENT, HIMACHAL PRADESH

1. Name of the post	Clerk
2. Number of posts	1 (one)
3. Classification	Class-III (Non-Gazetted) Ministerial Services.
4. Scale of pay	Rs. 3120-100-3220-110-3660-120-4260-140-4400-150-5000-160-5160.
5. Whether selection post or non-selection post.	Non-selection
6. Age for direct recruitment.	Between 18 and 40 years:

Provided that the upper age limit for direct recruits will not be applicable to the candidates already in service of the Government including those who have been appointed on *ad hoc* or on contract basis;

Provided further that if a candidate appointed on *ad hoc* basis or on contract basis had become overage on the date when he was appointed as such he shall not be eligible for any relaxation in the prescribed age limit by virtue of his such *ad hoc* or contract appointment;

Provided further that upper age limit is relaxable for Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes/Other Categories of persons to the extent permissible under the general or special order(s) of the Himachal Pradesh Government;

Provided further that the employees of all the Public Sector Corporations and Autonomous Bodies who happened

<p>to be Government Servants before absorption in the Public Sector Corporations/Autonomous Bodies at the time of initial constitutions of such Corporations / Autonomous Bodies shall be allowed age concession in direct recruitment as admissible to Government servants. This concession will not, however, be admissible to such staff of the Public Sector Corporations/Autonomous Bodies who were/are subsequently appointed by such Corporations/Autonomous Bodies and who are/were finally absorbed in the service of such Corporations/Autonomous Bodies after initial constitution of the Public Sector Corporations/Autonomous Bodies.</p>	<p>10. Method of recruitment—whether by direct recruitment or by promotion, deputation, transfer and the percentage of vacancies to be filled in by various methods.</p>	<p>100% by direct recruitment.</p>
<p>(1) Age limit for direct recruitment will be reckoned on the first day of the year in which the post(s) is/are advertised for inviting applications or notified to the Employment Exchanges or as the case may be.</p>	<p>11. In case of recruitment by promotion, deputation, transfer, grade from which promotion/deputation/transfer is to be made.</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>
<p>(2) Age and experience in the case of direct recruitment, relaxable at the discretion of the Himachal Pradesh Public Service Commission in case the candidate is otherwise well qualified.</p>	<p>12. If a Departmental Promotion Committee exists, what is its composition.</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>
<p>7. Minimum educational and other qualifications required for direct recruits.</p>	<p>13. Circumstances under which the H.P.P.S.C. is to be consulted in making recruitment.</p>	<p>As required under the law</p>
<p>(a) <i>Essential</i> :</p>	<p>14. Essential requirement for a direct recruitment.</p>	<p>A candidate for appointment to any service or post must be a citizen of India.</p>
<p>(i) Should have passed Matriculation with 11nd Division or 10+2 examination or its equivalent from a recognised Board/University.</p>	<p>15. Selection for appointment to post by direct recruitment.</p>	<p>Selection for appointment to the post in the case of direct recruitment shall be made on the basis of <i>viva voce</i> test, in Himachal Pradesh Public Service Commission or Other Recruiting Authority as the case may be, so consider necessary or expedient by a written test or a practical test, the standard/syllabus etc. of which will be determined by the Commission/Other Recruiting Authority as the case may be.</p>
<p>(ii) Should possess a minimum speed of 30 W.P. M. in English typewriting or 25 W.P. M. in Hindi typewriting.</p>	<p>16. Reservation</p>	<p>The appointment to the service shall be subject to orders regarding reservation in the service for Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes/Backward Classes/other categories of persons issued by the Himachal Pradesh Government from time to time.</p>
<p>(b) <i>Desirable</i> :</p>	<p>17. Powers to relax</p>	<p>Where the State Government is of the opinion that it is necessary or expedient to do so, it may, by order for reasons to be recorded in writing and in consultation with the H.P.P.S.C. relax any of the provisions of these rules with respect to any class or category of persons or posts.</p>
<p>8. Whether age and educational qualifications prescribed for direct recruits will apply in the case of the promoted.</p>	<p>Age : Not applicable Educational Qualifications: Not applicable.</p>	<p>GENERAL ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALITY AND PROTOCOL DEPARTMENT</p>
<p>9. Period of probation, if any.</p>	<p>Two years subject to such further extension for a period not exceeding one year as may be ordered by the competent authority in special circumstances and reasons to be recorded in writing.</p>	<p>NOTIFICATION</p>
<p>Shimla-2, the 6th December, 2000</p>	<p>No. Hosp. A(1)-8/99-1488.—In exercise of the powers conferred by proviso to Article 309 of the constitution of India and all other powers enabling him in this behalf, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh, in consultation with the Himachal Pradesh Public Service Commission is</p>	

pleased to make the Recruitment and Promotion Rules for the post of Junior Assistant (Non-Gazetted Class-III) in the Hospitality and Protocol Department, Himachal Pradesh, namely :—

1. *Short title and commencement.*—(1) These rules may be called the Himachal Pradesh Hospitality and Protocol Department, Junior Assistant (Non-Gazetted Class-III) Recruitment and Promotion Rules, 2000.

(2) These Rules shall come into force from the date of publication of this notification in the Rajpatha.

2. *Rules.*—The number of post(s) classification, pay scale, qualification and method of recruitment etc. for the post of Junior Assistant in the Hospitality and Protocol Department shall be as specified in Annexure-I to this notification.

By order,

Sd/-

Commissioner-cum-Secretary.

ANNEXURE "I"

RECRUITMENT AND PROMOTION RULES FOR THE POST OF JUNIOR ASSISTANT (NON-GAZETTED CLASS-III) IN THE DEPARTMENT OF HOSPITALITY AND PROTOCOL, HIMACHAL PRADESH

1. Name of the post	Junior Assistant
2. Number of posts	1 (One)
3. Classification	Class-III (Non-Gazetted) Ministerial Services.
4. Scale of pay	Rs. 4400-150-5000-160-5800-200-7000.
5. Whether selection post or Non-Selection post.	Non-selection
6. Age for direct recruitment.	Not applicable
7. Minimum educational and other qualifications required for direct recruits.	Not applicable
8. Whether age and educational qualifications prescribed for direct recruits will apply in the case of the promotees.	<i>Age:</i> Not applicable <i>Educational Qualifications:</i> Not applicable.
9. Period of probation, if any.	Two years subject to such further extension for a period not exceeding one year as may be ordered by the competent authority in special circumstances and reasons to be recorded in writing.
10. Method of recruitment—whether by direct recruitment or by promotion, deputation, transfer and the percentage of vacancies to be filled in by various methods.	100% by promotion.
11. In case of recruitment by promotion, deputation, transfer, grade from which promotion/deputation/transfer is to be made.	By promotion from amongst the Clerks with five years regular service or regular combined with continuous <i>ad hoc</i> (rendered upto 31-3-1998) service, if any, in the grade.

(1) In all cases of promotion, the continuous *ad hoc* service rendered in the feeder post upto 31-3-1998, if any, prior to regular appointment to the post shall be taken into account towards the length of service as prescribed in these rules for promotion subject to the condition that the *ad hoc* appointment/promotion in the feeder category had been made after following proper acceptable process of selection in accordance with the provisions of R. and P. Rules, provided that :—

In all cases where a junior person becomes eligible for consideration by virtue of his total length of service (including the service rendered on *ad hoc* basis upto 31-3-1998) followed by regular service/appointment in the feeder post in view of the provisions referred to above, all persons senior to him in the respective category/post/cadre shall be deemed to be eligible for consideration placed above the junior person in the field of consideration :

Provided that all incumbents to be considered for promotion shall possess the minimum qualifying service of at least three years or that prescribed the R. and P. Rules for post, whichever is less :

Provided further that where a person becomes ineligible to be considered for promotion on account of the requirements of the preceding proviso, the person(s) junior to him shall also be deemed to be ineligible for consideration for such promotion.

*Explanation.*—The last proviso shall not render the junior incumbents ineligible for consideration for promotion if the senior ineligible persons happened to be Ex-servicemen recruited under the provisions of Rule 3 of Demobilised Armed Forces Personnel (Reservation of Vacancies in Himachal State Non-Technical Services) Rules, 1972 and having been given the benefit of seniority thereunder or recruited under the provisions of Rule 3 of Ex-servicemen (Reservation of Vacancies in the Himachal Pradesh Technical Services) Rules, 1972 and having been given

the benefit of seniority thereunder.

(2) Similarly, in all cases of confirmation, continuous *ad hoc* service rendered on the feeder post upto 31-3-1998, if any, prior to the regular appointment against such post shall be taken into account towards the length of service, if the *ad hoc* appointment/promotion against such post had been made after proper selection and in accordance with the provision of R. & P. Rules :

Provided that *inter se* seniority as a result of confirmation after taking into account *ad hoc* service rendered upto 31-3-1998 as referred to above shall remain unchanged.

12. If a Departmental Promotion Committee exists, what is its composition.

As may be constituted by the Government from time to time.

13. Circumstances under which the H.P.P.S.C is to be consulted in making recruitment.

As required under the law.

14. Essential requirement for a direct recruitment.

Not applicable

15. Selection for appointment to post by direct recruitment.

Not applicable

16. Reservation

The appointment to the service shall be subject to orders regarding reservation in the service for Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes/Other Backward Classes/Other Categories of persons issued by the Himachal Pradesh Government from time to time.

17. Departmental Examination.

Not applicable

18. Powers to relax

Where the State Government is of the opinion that it is necessary or expedient to do so, it may, by order for reasons to be recorded in writing and in consultation with the Himachal Pradesh Public Service Commission, relax any of the provisions of these rules with respect to any class or category of persons or posts.

श्रम एवं रोजगार विभाग

प्रधानमंत्री

शिमला-2, 4 जून, 2001

गंभीर श्रम (बी) 2-20/97.—हिमाचल प्रदेश के रोजगार, भारत के संविधान के अनुच्छेद 309 के परन्तु द्वारा प्रदत्त शर्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, हिमाचल प्रदेश लोक सेवा आयोग के परामर्श

से, उस विभाग की समर्थनक अधिकृताना नामीय 30-10-1998 द्वारा अधिसूचित, हिमाचल प्रदेश श्रम एवं रोजगार विभाग में सुनियम अमायकृत, वर्ग-1 (राजपत्रित) के पद के भर्ती एवं प्रोन्नति नियम, 1998 में मंजूरीदार करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाते हैं, अर्थात् :

1. संक्षिप्त नाम और प्रारम्भ.—(i) इन नियमों का मंजूरीदार नाम हिमाचल प्रदेश श्रम एवं रोजगार विभाग अमायकृत, वर्ग-1 (राजपत्रित) भर्ती एवं प्रोन्नति (प्रथम मंजूरीदार) नियम, 2001 है।

(ii) ये नियम राजपत्र, हिमाचल प्रदेश में प्रकाशित किए जाने की तारीख से प्रदूषित होंगे।

2. उपबन्ध 'क' का मंजूरीदार.—हिमाचल प्रदेश श्रम एवं रोजगार विभाग अमायकृत, वर्ग-1 (राजपत्रित) भर्ती एवं प्रोन्नति नियम, 1998 के उपबन्ध 'क' में :

स्वतंष्म संख्या 11 के सामने विद्यमान उपबन्धों के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित प्रतिश्वापित किए जाएंगे, अर्थात् :

"उप-अमायकृत में से जिसका 3 वर्ष का नियमित मेवाकाल या योग्य में (31-3-1998) तक की गई लगातार तदर्थे जैव यादि कोई हो, को मंजूरीदार करके 3 वर्ष का प्रयुक्त नियमित मेवाकाल हो, प्रोन्नति द्वारा :

(1) प्रोन्नति के मंजूरी सामनों में पद पर नियमित नियुक्ति में पूर्व सम्मत एवं 31-3-1998 तक की गई निरलत तदर्थे सेवा, यदि कोई हो, प्रोन्नति के लिये इन नियमों में यथाविहित मेवाकाल के लिए, इन एवं इनके अन्तर्गत रहते हुए गणना में ली जाएगी, कि सम्प्रभाग के अनुसार उपनाम की अपनाने के पश्चात की गई ही। परन्तु यह कि उन सभी सामनों में जिनमें कोई उपनाम की अपनाने के पश्चात अन्यतर अनुसार एवं ग्रामीण पद में अपने कुल मेवाकाल (31-3-1998 तक तदर्थ आगामी पद की गई तदर्थ मेवा महित जैव नियमित सेवा/नियुक्ति के अनुसार में ही, को शामिल करके) के आधार पर उपर्युक्त निर्दिष्ट उपबन्धों के कारण विचार किए जाने का पात्र हो जाता है वहाँ अपने-अपने प्रबंध/वैदि/काड़ि में उससे वरिष्ठ मंजूरी व्यक्ति विचार किए जाने के पात्र सभी जाएंगे और विचार करते समय कनिष्ठ व्यक्ति में ऊपर रखे जाएंगे।

परन्तु उन मंजूरी पदधारियों की, जिन पर प्रोन्नति के लिये विचार किया जाता है, की कम से कम तीन वर्ष की अनुनयम अद्देना मेवा या पद के भर्ती एवं प्रोन्नति नियमों में विविध सेवा जैव मंजूरी कम ही, होगी :

परन्तु यह और भी कि जहाँ कोई व्यक्ति पूर्वगमी परन्तुक की व्यापेक्षाओं के कारण प्रोन्नति किए जाने सम्बन्धी विचार के लिये प्राप्त हो जाता है, वहाँ उससे कनिष्ठ व्यक्ति भी मंजूरी प्रोन्नति के विचार के लिए आगत ममता जाएगा/ममता जाएंगे।

स्पष्टीकरण.—ग्रन्ति परन्तुक के अन्तर्गत कनिष्ठ पदधारी प्रोन्नति के लिए प्राप्त नहीं ममता जाएगा/समझ जाएगे, यदि वर्तित ग्रामीण व्यक्ति भर्तीपूर्व सीनिक है, जिसे डिपोर्टेशनाईर्बायार्मेंड फोरिम पर्सोनल (रिजर्वेशन ग्राफ वैकेन्सील) इन हिमाचल स्टेट नान-टैकीलकन मार्किज रूल्ज, 1972 के नियम 3 के प्रावधानों के अन्तर्गत भर्ती की गया हो तथा इसके अन्तर्गत वरियता लाभ दिए गए हों या जिसे एकम मविम मैन (रिजर्वेशन ग्राफ वैकेन्सील इन द्वारा हिमाचल प्रदेश ईक्सीलकन मार्किज) रूल्ज, 1985 के नियम 3 के प्रावधानों के अन्तर्गत भर्ती की गया हो तथा इनके अन्तर्गत वरीयता लाभ दिए गए हों।

(2) इसी प्रकार स्थायीकरण के सभी सामनों में ऐसे पद पर नियमित/प्रोन्नति से पूर्व 31-3-1998 तक की गई तदर्थ मेवा यदि कोई हो, सेवाकाल के लिए गणना में ली जायेगी, यदि तदर्थ नियमित/प्रोन्नति उचित बदल के पश्चात और भर्ती एवं प्रोन्नति नियमों के उपबन्धों के अनुसार की गई ही।

परन्तु 31-3-98 तक की गई उपर्युक्त निर्दिष्ट तदर्थ मेवा की गणना में लेने के पश्चात जो स्थाइकरण होगा उसके फलस्वरूप पारस्परिक वरीयता प्रपरिवर्तित होगी।

आदेश द्वारा,

आर० मट्टाचार्य,  
वित्तायुक्त एवं मंचित।

Authoritative English text of this department notification  
No. Shim(B) 2 20/97, dated 4-6-2001 as registered under  
clause (1) of Article 348 of the Constitution of India)

## LABOUR & EMPLOYMENT DEPARTMENT

### NOTIFICATION

Shimla-171002, the 4th June, 2001

No. Shim(B) 2 20/97. In exercise of the powers conferred by proviso to Article 109 of the Constitution of India, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh in consultation with the Himachal Pradesh Public Service Commission is pleased to make the following Rules to amend the Himachal Pradesh Labour & Employment Department, Joint Labour Commissioner, Class I (Gazetted) Recruitment and Promotion Rules, 1998, notified vide this department notification of even number, dated 30-10-1998, namely :

1. *Short title and commencement.* (1) These rules may be called the Himachal Pradesh Labour and Employment Department, Joint Labour Commissioner, Class I (Gazetted) Recruitment and Promotion (First Amendment) Rules, 2001.

(2) These rules shall come into force from the date of its publication in the Rastrapati, Himachal Pradesh.

2. *Amendment of Annexure 'A'.* In Annexure 'A' to the Himachal Pradesh Labour & Employment Department, Joint Labour Commissioner, Class I (Gazetted) Recruitment and Promotion Rules, 1998:

For the existing provisions against Column No. 11, the following shall be substituted, namely:

"By promotion from amongst the Deputy Labour Commissioner who possess 3 years' regular service or regular combined (with continuous ad hoc rendered upto 31-3-1998) service if any in the grade .

(1) In all cases of promotion, the continuous ad hoc service rendered in the feeder post upto 31-3-1998, if any, prior to regular appointment to the post shall be taken into account towards the length of service as prescribed in these rules for promotion subject to the condition that the ad hoc appointment/promotion in the feeder category had been made after following proper acceptable process of selection in accordance with the provisions

of Recruitment and Promotion Rules, provided that in all cases where a junior person becomes eligible for consideration by virtue of his total length of service (including the service rendered on ad hoc basis upto 31-3-1998) in the feeder post in view of the provisions referred to above, all persons senior to him in the respective category/post/grade shall be deemed to be eligible for consideration and placed above the junior person in the field of consideration:

Provided that all incumbents to be considered for promotion shall possess the minimum qualifying service of at least 3 years or that prescribed in the R & P Rules for the post, whichever is less:

Provided further that where a person becomes ineligible to be considered for promotion on account of the requirements of the preceding proviso, the person(s) junior to him shall also be deemed to be ineligible for consideration for such promotion.

*Explanation.*—The first proviso shall not render the junior incumbents ineligible for consideration for promotion if the senior ineligible persons happened to be ex-servicemen recruited under the provisions of Rule 3 of Demobilised Armed Forces Personnel (Reservation of Vacancies in Himachal State Non-Technical Services) Rules, 1972 and having been given the benefit of seniority thereunder or recruited under the provisions of Rule 3 of Ex-servicemen (Reservation of Vacancies in the Himachal Pradesh Technical Services) Rules, 1985 and having been given the benefit of seniority thereunder.

(2) Similarly in all cases of confirmation, ad hoc service rendered on the feeder post upto 31-3-1998, if any, prior to the regular appointment against such post shall be taken into account, towards the length of service, if the ad hoc appointment/promotion had been made after proper selection and in accordance with the provisions of the R & P Rules :

Provided that inter-se seniority as a result of confirmation after taking into account, ad hoc service rendered upto 31-3-1998 as referred to above shall remain unchanged.

By order,

R. BHATTACHARYA,  
Financial Commissioner-cum-Secretary.

भाग-4- राजनीति व्यापक साक्षात्, स्मृतिस्तिप्त बोर्ड, इस्टिन्यु बोर्ड, नीटफाइट और डाक्टर एवं विद्या तथा पंचायती राज विभाग

—लूप्य—

### भाग-5- लोकसत्रक अधिसूचनाएं और विज्ञापन

१ भद्रातल धोमती तात्पुर शाहिल, उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी,  
मुमाली, जिला विवाहायु, दिवालय विदेश

धोमती छड़ी देवी पांची श्री छुल्ला याम, निवासी याम व डाकमं  
पट्टी, तहसील अमृता, जिला विवाहायु, दिवालय विदेश

... प्राप्तिनी ।

दलाल

आम विवाह

प्राप्तिनी-पत्र द्वे भाग १३(३) उप-मण्डल पंचायत अधिनियम,  
1968

धोमती छड़ी देवी पांची श्री छुल्ला याम, निवासी याम व डाक-  
मंपट्टी, परवाना इच्छादू, तहसील अमृता, जिला विवाहायु,  
दिवालय विदेश ने इस कार्यालय में 21-6-2001 को ग्रामीण-पत्र

प्रेषिया। उसने शार्धेना की है कि प्राप्तिनी (धोमती छड़ी देवी) की  
जयंती पूर्णावण ५-१-१९५३ है जो कि सही है जबकि पूर्णावण में  
१९५३ ही है जैसे।

परं इस दस्तावेज़ द्वारा समत जयंता को संचित किया जाता है  
कि वही विसी धारिता को उक्त प्राप्तिनी छड़ी देवी विदेश याम  
को जयंत दिनांक ५-१-१९५३ धारी धारिता किरण का उजर एवं एतत्तजा  
है। तो वह दिनांक ५-८-२००१ की प्रसावतत व वकालतत हाजिर  
होकर धाराना उजर वेश कर सकता है। बहुरत वैराजाजी एकतरफा  
कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी।

प्राप्त दिनांक २२-६-२००१ को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर प्रदातात  
से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

राजिन काल्पन,  
उप-मण्डल इण्डिपिन्डी,  
मुमाली, जिला विवाहायु (हि०प्र०)

स्वामीनाथ उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी, भटियात रिप्त चूवाडी, जिला चम्बा (हिं प्र०)

भ्रातालती इष्टहार

भी कमल थापा पुत्र श्री दुकम गिरह, निवासी कालू गंज, शिरिया ।

नाम

थापा जनता

प्रदर्शनात जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु गंजीकरण अधिनयम, 1960.

भी कमल थापा पुत्र श्री दुकम गिरह, निवासी कालू गंज, ककीरा, जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश ने एक प्रार्थना-पत्र हालांकान माहित प्रस्तुत करके प्रार्थना की है कि उसके लड़के पुत्रजन थापा की जन्म तिथि गलती से पचास दिनों से 7-10-1900 निर्धारित है जिस को शिरी जन्म दिन 7-8-1900 व नाम थापा पंचायत ककोरा में शीक दर्ज करने के आदेश जारी किया जाए।

लिहाजा बनारेश्वर इष्टहार गवर्नराधिकारण को गृहित किया जाता है कि धारा १५का जन्म थापा की जन्म तिथि पचास दिनों की शीर्षक में ठीक पर्याप्त करने के सम्बन्ध में किसी को उज्जर या एतराज हो ना वह दिनोंक 31-7-2001 को हड्ड ल्यायालग में हाजिर होकर प्रस्तुत करे अन्यथा नाम व जन्म तिथि दर्ज करने के आदेश जारी कर दिये जाएं।

धारा दिनांक 28-8-2001 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदान्त से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षित/-  
उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी,  
भटियात रिप्त चूवाडी,  
जिला चम्बा (हिं प्र०)

ल्यायालग उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी, भटियात रिप्त चूवाडी, जिला चम्बा (हिं प्र०)

भी अशोक कुमार पुत्र श्री परस राम, निवासी तलाई, तहसील भटियात।

नाम

थापा जनता

प्रदर्शनात जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु गंजीकरण अधिनयम, 1960.

भी अशोक कुमार पुत्र श्री परस राम, निवासी तलाई, तहसील भटियात, जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश ने एक प्रार्थना-पत्र हल्फी धान सहित प्रस्तुत करके प्रार्थना की है कि उसकी लड़की मीनाथी की जन्म तिथि 13-6-1999 व नाम थापा पंचायत बनेट में दर्ज नहीं है तथा वर्ज करने के आदेश जारी किये जाएं।

लिहाजा बनारेश्वर इष्टहार गवर्नराधिकारण को सूचित किया जाता है कि उसकी मीनाथी का नाम व जन्म तिथि पचास दिनों के दर्ज में दर्ज करने के सम्बन्ध में किसी को उज्जर या एतराज हो तो वह दिनोंक 31-7-2001 को हड्ड ल्यायालग में हाजिर होकर प्रस्तुत करे अन्यथा नाम व जन्म तिथि दर्ज करने के आदेश जारी कर दिये जाएं।

धारा दिनांक 27-8-2001 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदान्त से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षित/-  
उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी,  
भटियात रिप्त चूवाडी,  
जिला चम्बा (हिं प्र०)

व अदान्त श्री जे ० एम० पठानिया (हिं प्र० मे०), वन्दीवन्त शीर्षकारी, भृ-एकत्रीकरण विभाग, हमीरपुर (हिं प्र०)

केस नं० २१३/२०००

श्रीनारेश्वर याम पुत्र स्व० श्री गुरजन राम, निवासी टीका भ्रातालती इष्टहार, गोजा मेवा, तहसील भोरंज, जिला हमीरपुर (हिं प्र०) .. यामी ।

नाम

१. गंजीत कमार पुत्र जन्मदीण राम, २. मेहर चन्द्र पुत्र राम० श्री गुरजन राम, निवासी गोजा मेवा, तहसील भोरंज, जिला हमीरपुर (हिं प्र०) .. प्रतिवारीगण।

प्रकटमा यामीन धारा 30 (3) हिं प्र० भृ-एकत्रीकरण शार्धान्तयम, 1971।

उपरोक्त उन्नान केम में लूटरिया राम में गंजीत कुमार शार्द एवं यामीन धारा 30 (3) हिं प्र० भृ-एकत्रीकरण अधिनियम, 1971 के तहन प्रार्थी वामर की है। प्रतिवारीगण गंजीत कुमार पुत्र जन्मदीण राम तथा मेहर चन्द्र पुत्र गुरजन राम, निवासी गोजा मेवा, तहसील भोरंज, जिला हमीरपुर को माध्यराम नरीके में तामील मध्यन रहने हो रही है। उसे इष्टहार द्वारा मृत्युन किया जाता है कि वे यामी याम के मध्यन्य में जो टांका लवाह, गोजा मेवा, तहसील भोरंज, जिला हमीरपुर में रियत है की गैरीकी के लिए अमानत या वकालत तहां समझ मेरी कीमा अदान्त मोरंज में दिनोंक 8-8-2001 को हाजिर धारा १८ अन्यथा धारा के विषय पक्त तरफा कार्रवाई अपन में लाई जावेगी।

यह इष्टहार धारा दिनांक 7-7-2001 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर सहित हड्ड अदान्त से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

ने० एम० पठानिया,  
वन्दीवन्त शीर्षकारी,  
भृ-एकत्रीकरण विभाग,  
हमीरपुर (हिं प्र०)।

प्रदानती इष्टहार

व अदान्त श्री जे ० एम० पठानिया (हिं प्र० मे०), वन्दीवन्त शीर्षकारी, भृ-एकत्रीकरण विभाग, हमीरपुर, हिमाचल प्रदेश

केस नं० ११६/१०००

१. बद्री प्रसाद, रणजीत सिंह पुत्र लच्छमण, निवासी टीका दयोग, गोजा मेवा, तहसील भोरंज, जिला हमीरपुर, हिमाचल प्रदेश .. बादीगण।

नाम

१. प्रनाम सिंह, २. सुरण कुमार पुत्र कांसी राम, ३. अमर सिंह, ४. जान चन्द्र, ५. त्रेय सिंह पुत्र तुलसी राम, ६. गोपन लाल, ७. बूज लाल पुत्र गुन्दर, ८. रमेश चन्द्र पुत्र व श्रीमती सरबी देवी विधवा कृष्ण लाल, ९. गोपेश, १०. कुलदीपी, ११. गंजीत पुत्र रोजन, १२. पारे लाल, १३. कर्म चन्द्र पुत्र चौपरी राम, १४. गारीराम, १५. दुर्मी चन्द्र, १६. रसन चन्द्र, १७. गाली राम, १८. मनोजी राम, १९. नान राम पुत्र महन्त राम, २०. श्रीमती प्रकाशी देवी विधवा पारीराम, २१. बेली राम, २२. धर्म सिंह, २३. रियो राम, २४. जगदीप चन्द्र, २५. युवराम पुत्र भगवाना, २६. बलनान राम पुत्र चड्डत, २७. नरेण दास पुत्र जबाहर, २८. श्रीमती कमला देवी विश्वा, २९. रजनी देवी पुत्री सोने लाल, ३०. युवरेत दुष्मान पुत्र रामराम, ३१. निती देवी विधवा जबाहर, ३२. गद्दी पुत्र प्रभवयाल, ३३. शशी कुमार पुत्र गाध राम, ३४. हरदेव, ३५. जोगिन्द्र, ३६. हरनाम मिह पुत्र व श्रीमती होपती पुत्री लच्छमण, ३७. रसन चन्द्र, ३८. चोरा पुत्र सुन्दर, ३९. गलबेन पुत्र निरजन, निवासी गड़ोला, तहसील भोरंज, जिला हमीरपुर, ४०. मिलदी पुत्र मुन्दर, निवासी गड़ोला, तहसील भोरंज, जिला हमीरपुर, हिमाचल प्रदेश .. प्रतिवारीगण।

मुकद्दमा अधीन धारा 30(3) हि० प्र० भू-एकत्रीकरण अधिनियम,  
1971.

उपरोक्त उनवान केस में बद्री प्रशाद आदि ने प्रताप सिंह आदि पर धारा 30(3) हि० प्र० भू-एकत्रीकरण अधिनियम, 1971 के तहत अधीन दायर की है। प्रतिवादीयोग को तामील समन साधारण तरीके से नहीं हो रही है तथा प्रतिवादीयोग मुहाल हजा० से बाहर रहते हैं। उन्हें इस इष्टहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि वे असालतन या वकालतन हमारे समक्ष मेरी कैप्ट आदालत मुकाम भोरंज में दिनांक 8-8-2001 को हाजिर आएं अन्यथा आपके विरुद्ध एकत्रफा कार्रवाई अमल में लाई जावेगी।

यह इष्टहार आज दिनांक 7-7-2001 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर सहित इस अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

जे० एस० पठानिया,  
बन्दोवस्त अधिकारी,  
भू-एकत्रीकरण विभाग,  
हमीरपुर, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

अदालती इष्टहार

व अदालत श्री जे० एस० पठानिया (हि० प्र० से०) बन्दोवस्त अधिकारी, भू-एकत्रीकरण विभाग, हमीरपुर (हि० प्र०)

केसनं० : 116/99.

रोशन लाल पुत्र सुन्दर विह, वासी टीका दयोग, मोजा मेवा, तहसील भोरंज, जिला हमीरपुर (हि० प्र०)। . . वारी।

बनाम

1. प्रताप सिंह, 2. सुरेण कुमार पुत्र कांशी राम, 3. अमर सिंह, 4. जान चन्द, 5. प्रेम सिंह पुत्र तलसी राम, 6. रोशन लाल, 7. बुज लाल पुत्र सुन्दर, 8. रमेश चन्द पुत्र व श्रीमती सरबी देवी विधवा रूप लाल, 9. राकेश, 10. कुलदीप, 11. संजीव पुत्र रोशन, 12. प्यारे लाल, 13. कर्म चन्द पुत्र चौधरी राम, 14. आगीरथ, 15. दुनी चन्द, 16. गत्त चन्द, 17. साली राम, 18. मन्नी राम, 19. नाथ राम पुत्र महन्त राम, 20. श्रीमती प्रकाशी देवी विधवा आगीरथ, 21. बेनी राम, 22. धर्म सिंह, 23. रिखी राम, 24. जगतेश चन्द, 25. सुन्दर पुत्र भगवाना, 26. खजाना राम पुत्र चड्ठु, 27. नरेण दाम पुत्र जवाहर, 28. श्रीमती कमला देवी विधवा 29. जननी देवी पुत्री नामी लाल, 30. सुरेन्द्र कुमार पुत्र रामरथ, 31. जन्नी देवी विधवा जवाहर, 32. गददी पुत्र प्रभदयाल, 33. श्रीमी कुमार पुत्र साध राम, 34. हरदेव, 35. हरनाम निहुतु व श्रीमती द्रोपीती देवी पुत्री लच्छमण, 37. गत्त चन्द, 38. चौरा पुत्र सुन्दर, 39. बलदेव पुत्र निरंजन, निवासीयोग मुहाल दयोग, मोजा मेवा, तहसील भोरंज, जिला हमीरपुर (हि० प्र०) . . . प्रतिवादीयोग।

मुकद्दमा अधीन धारा 30(3) हि० प्र० भू-एकत्रीकरण अधिनियम, 1971.

उपरोक्त उनवान केस में रोशन लाल ने प्रताप विह आदि पर अधीन धारा 30(3) हिमाचल प्रदेश भू-एकत्रीकरण अधिनियम, 1971 के तहत अधीन दायर की है। प्रतिवादीयोग को तामील समन साधारण तरीके से नहीं हो रही है तथा प्रतिवादीयोग मुहाल हजा० से बाहर रहते हैं। इन्हें इस इष्टहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि वे असालतन या वकालतन हमारे समक्ष मेरी कैप्ट आदालत मुकाम भोरंज में दिनांक 8-8-2001 को हाजिर आएं अन्यथा आपके विरुद्ध एकत्रफा कार्रवाई अमल में लाई जावेगी।

यह इष्टहार आज दिनांक 7-7-2001 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर सहित इस अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

जे० एस० पठानिया,  
बन्दोवस्त अधिकारी,  
भू-एकत्रीकरण विभाग,  
हमीरपुर (हि० प्र०)।

व अदालत श्री जे० एस० पठानिया (हि० प्र० से०), बन्दोवस्त अधिकारी, भू-एकत्रीकरण विभाग, हमीरपुर (हि० प्र०)

केस नं० : 140/2000

श्री उद्धम सिंह उक्त उद्धो राम पुत्र रामसरण, गंव संगरोह खुदं, डॉ समीरपुर, तप्पा वमसन, तहसील भोरंज, जिला हमीरपुर (हि० प्र०) . . . वारी।

बनाम

1. विधि चन्द पुत्र लच्छमण, 2. प्रेम मिह पुत्र लच्छमण,  
3. जगदीश पुत्र लच्छमण, निवासीयोग मुहाल बगवाडा, तप्पा वमसन, तहसील भोरंज, जिला हमीरपुर (हि० प्र०) . . . प्रतिवादीयोग।

मुकद्दमा अधीन धारा 30(3) हि० प्र० भू-एकत्रीकरण अधिनियम, 1971.

उपरोक्त उनवान केस में उधम सिंह उक्त उद्धो राम ने अधीन धारा 30(3) हि० प्र० भू-एकत्रीकरण अधिनियम, 1971 के तहत विधि चन्द आदि के खिलाफ अधीन दायर की है। प्रतिवादीयोग प्रेम सिंह तथा जगदीश निवासीयोग टोका बगवाडा, तप्पा वमसन, तहसील भोरंज, जिला हमीरपुर को तामील समन साधारण तरीके से नहीं हो रही है तथा प्रतिवादीयोग सुहाल हजा० से बाहर रहते हैं। उन्हें इस इष्टहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि वे असालतन या वकालतन हमारे समक्ष मेरी कैप्ट आदालत में दिनांक 8-8-2001 को हाजिर आएं। अन्यथा आपके विरुद्ध एकत्रफा कार्रवाई अमल में लाई जावेगी।

यह इष्टहार आज दिनांक 7-7-2001 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर सहित इस अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

जे० एस० पठानिया,  
बन्दोवस्त अधिकारी,  
भू-एकत्रीकरण विभाग,  
हमीरपुर (हि० प्र०)।

व अदालत श्री के० डी० राणा, स्पैशल मैरिज अधिकारी, बड़सर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि० प्र०)

1. श्री मुनील दत सुपुत्र श्री भगवान दास, वासी मोरसू गारला डाकघर भोटा, तहसील बड़सर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि० प्र०)।

2. श्रीमती रजनी मैहता सुपुत्री श्री रामरत्न मैहता, वासी हाऊस नं० 3408, हलालपुरा टाऊन, सरहिन्द मण्डी, जिला फतेहगढ़, साहिब (पंजाब) . . . प्रार्थीयोग।

बनाम

आम जनता

उनवान.—प्रार्थना-पत्र जे० धारा 15 स्पैशल मैरिज एकट, 1954 के अन्तर्गत शादी पंजीकृत करने वारे।

उपरोक्त मुकद्दमा में श्री मुनील दत व श्रीमती रजनी मैहता ने दिनांक 20-6-2001 को इस अदालत में प्रार्थना-पत्र पेश किया कि उद्दृष्टि दिनांक 30-5-1999 को हिन्दू वैति-रिवाज के अनुसार गांव मोरसू गारला, डाकघर भोटा, तहसील बड़सर, जिला हमीरपुर में शादी कर ली है और तब से पंति-पत्नी के रूप में रहते आ रहे हैं। जे० धारा 15 स्पैशल मैरिज एकट, 1954 के अन्तर्गत शादी पंजीकृत की जावे।

अन: आम जनता को इस इष्टहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी भी व्यक्ति को इस शादी को पंजीकृत करने वारे कोई गत्राज हो तो वह दिनांक 30-5-1999 को समय 10.00 बजे प्रतः हाजिर अदालत आकर अपना एतराज पेश कर सकता है अन्यथा कार्यवाही एक तरफा अमल में लाई जावेगी।

ग्राज दिनांक 3-7-2001 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ ।

मोहर ।

के० श्री० राणा,  
स्पैशल पैरेज अधिकारी,  
वडसर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि० प्र०) ।

व अदालत श्री गोकल चन्द शर्मा, सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी, भोरंज, जिला हमीरपुर, हिमाचल प्रदेश

मु० न० 153/2000 तथा 151/2000.

श्री वाव राम उर्फ किशन चन्द पुत्र गंगा, वासी राहवीं, तप्पा बमसन, तहसील भोरंज, जिला हमीरपुर (हि० प्र०) । वादी ।

बनाम

(1) श्री बलवन्न सिंह, (2) अजीत सिंह पिसरान अमर सिंह, (3) भागी रथ पुत्र खड़क, (4) अमी चन्द पुत्र खड़क, (5) सत्या देवी वेवा, (6) संदेश कुमार, (7) अनिल कुमार, (8) विजय कुमार पिसरान अमर नाथ, 1 ता० 4, वासीगण गहवीं व 5 ता० 8 वासीगण बलोड़, तप्पा बमसन, तहसील भोरंज, जिला हमीरपुर, हिमाचल प्रदेश प्रतिवादीगण ।

प्रार्थना-पत्र वराए तकसीम भूमि खाता न० 44, खतीनी न० 69-70, ख० न० किता 2, रकवा ता० 3क० 8म०, टीका राहवीं, तप्पा बमसन ।

उपरोक्त मुकदमा में बलवन्न सिंह वर्गी प्रतिवादीगण को कई बार समन जारी किए गए मगर उनकी तामील असालतन न हो रही है । वे जान-बूझ कर अदालत में हाजर आने में टाल-मटोल कर रहे हैं । इसलिए इस अदालत को पूर्ण विश्वास हो चुका है कि उनकी तामील साधारण ढंग से करवाया जाना कठिन है ।

अतः उपरोक्त प्रतिवादीगण को इस राजपत्र इस्तहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि वे वराए पैरवी मुकदमा असालतन या वकालत दिनांक 26-7-2001 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे हाजर अदालत आवे अन्यथा एकपक्षीय कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जावेगी ।

ग्राज दिनांक 5-7-2001 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ ।

मोहर ।

गोकल चन्द शर्मा,  
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी,  
भोरंज, जिला हमीरपुर,  
हिमाचल प्रदेश ।

व अदालत श्री गोकल चन्द शर्मा, सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी, भोरंज, जिला हमीरपुर, हिमाचल प्रदेश

मु० न० 139/2000 तथा 144/2000.

श्री जगत युवत गमना वर्गी, वासीगण लदरौर कलां, तप्पा मैहलता, तहसील भोरंज, जिला हमीरपुर (हि० प्र०) । प्रार्थी ।

बनाम

रण सिंह पुत्र मसदी वर्गी, वासीगण लदरौर कलां, तप्पा मैहलता, तहसील भोरंज, जिला हमीरपुर (हि० प्र०) प्रतिवादीगण ।

प्रार्थना-पत्र वराए तकसीम भूमि खाता न० 124, खतीनी न० 140, ख० न० किता 33, रकवा तादादी 62क० 3म०, वासीगण लदरौर कलां, तप्पा मैहलता ।

नोटिस बनाम :

(1) श्री लालमन, (2) सन्त राम पिसरान भगती, वासी-गण लदरौर कलां, तप्पा मैहलता ।

उपरोक्त मुकदमा में उपरोक्त प्रतिवादीगण श्री भगत राम व सन्त राम को कई बार समन जारी किए गए मगर उनकी तामील

असालतन न हो रही है । वे जान-बूझ कर अदालत में हाजर न आने में टाल-मटोल कर रहे हैं । इसलिए अदालत को पूर्ण विश्वास हो चुका है कि उनकी तामील साधारण ढंग से करवाया जाना कठिन है ।

अतः श्री लाल मन वर्गी को इस राजपत्र इस्तहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि वे दिनांक 26-7-2001 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे हाजर अदालत आकर असालतन या वकालत पैरवी मुकदमा करें अन्यथा वैर-हाजरी की सूरत में यकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जावेगी ।

ग्राज दिनांक 5-7-2001 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ ।

मोहर ।

गोकल चन्द शर्मा,  
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी,  
भोरंज, जिला हमीरपुर,  
हिमाचल प्रदेश ।

व अदालत श्री गोकल चन्द शर्मा, सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी, भोरंज, जिला हमीरपुर, हिमाचल प्रदेश

मुकदमा न० 55/2000.

श्री प्रीतम चन्द पुत्र छेवर, वासीगण चम्बोह, तप्पा मेवा, तहसील भोरंज, जिला हमीरपुर (हि० प्र०) । वादी ।

बनाम

श्री भगत युवत युवती रोहनी वर्गी, वासीगण चम्बोह, तप्पा मेवा, तहसील भोरंज, जिला हमीरपुर (हि० प्र०) प्रतिवादीगण ।

प्रार्थना-पत्र वराए तकसीम भूमि खाता न० 446, खतीनी न० 651, ख० न० किता 16, रकवा ता० 43क० 017 म०, वाक्या टीका चम्बोह, तप्पा मेवा ।

नोटिस बनाम :

(1) श्री अमर नाथ, (2) ओंकार पिसरान, (3) कौशल्या देवी, (4) रत्नी देवी, (5) शकुनला देवी, (6) निमला, (7) सामा पृवियां, (8) भोपी देवी वेवा तोता, वासीगण चम्बोह, तप्पा मेवा । प्रतिवादीगण ।

उपरोक्त मुकदमा में श्री अमर नाथ वर्गी प्रतिवादीगण को कई बार समन जारी किए गए मगर रिपोर्ट तामील कुनिनदा अनुसार उनकी तामील असालतन न हो रही है । वे जान-बूझ कर अदालत में आने में टाल-मटोल कर रहे हैं । इसलिए अदालत को पूर्ण विश्वास हो चुका है कि उनकी तामील साधारण ढंग से करवाना जाना कठिन है ।

अतः श्री अमर नाथ वर्गी प्रतिवादीगण को इस इस्तहार राजपत्र द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि वे दिनांक 26-7-2001 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे इस अदालत में आकर असालतन या वकालत पैरवी मुकदमा करें अन्यथा वैर-हाजरी की सूरत में यकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जावेगी ।

ग्राज दिनांक 5-7-2001 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ ।

मोहर ।

गोकल चन्द शर्मा,  
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी,  
भोरंज, जिला हमीरपुर,  
हिमाचल प्रदेश ।

व अदालत श्री गोकल चन्द शर्मा, सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी, भोरंज, जिला हमीरपुर, हिमाचल प्रदेश

मु० न० 110/2000.

श्री अमर नाथ युवत श्री दुर्गा, वासी कुड़, तप्पा मेवा, तहसील भोरंज, जिला हमीरपुर, हिमाचल प्रदेश । वादी ।



उपरोक्त मुकदमा उनवान वाला में प्रतिवादीयन न) । ता 8 का अदालत हजा द्वारा बार-बार समन जारा किए गये परत्वे वे हाजर अदालत नहीं हो रहे हैं। अदालत हजा को पूर्ण विवाद हो गया है कि समनों की तारीख साधारण तरीका से नहीं हो सकती।

अतः इस इष्टतहार राजपत्र द्वारा सुचित किया जाता है कि पर्याकोदयम न) । ता 8 मिति 2-8-2001 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे हाजिर अदालत आकर पैरवी मुकदमा करें व सूरत ऐग्हाजी उनके बिलाफ कार्यवाही यकतरका अमल में लाई जायेगी। दीगर कोई उजर कविले समाप्त न होगा।

आज दिनांक 23-5-2001 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत सहित जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

सुषमा वत्स,  
तहसीलदार एवं सहायक समाहूता प्रथम श्रेणी,  
जसवां कोटला, जिला कांगड़ा (हि० प्र०)।

व अदालत श्रीमती सुषमा वत्स, कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, तहसील जसवां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि० प्र०)

व मुकदमा: जन्म प्रमाण-पत्र

मुकदमा नं० 8/2001.

मध्यवाला

बनाम

आम जनता

दरखास्त जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

नोटिस वनाम आम जनता।

श्रीमती मध्यवाला ने इस न्यायालय में दरखास्त दी है कि उसकी पुत्री प्रिया रानी का जन्म पंचाबत रिकांड में गलती से दर्ज न करवाया गया है। अब दर्ज किया जावे। इसकी पुत्री की जन्म तिथि 6-12-1995 है तथा बच्ची का जन्म गांव पट्टी में हुआ है।

अतः इस नोटिस द्वारा समस्त जनता तथा सम्बन्धी रिशेवारों को सुचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को उसका नाम दर्ज करवाने वारे कोई आपत्ति अगर हो तो वह दिनांक 2-8-2001 समय वस बजे प्रातः स्वयं ध्यया किसी बांधित के माध्यम से हमारे समक्ष अदालत में हाजिर आकर पेश करें अन्यथा एक तरका कार्यवाही समक्ष में लाई जायेगी।

आज दिनांक 1-6-2001 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

सुषमा वत्स,  
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,  
जसवां स्थित कोटला, जिला कांगड़ा (हि० प्र०)।

व अदालत श्री आर० बी० शाहिलया, तहसीलदार एवं अधिकारी उप-रजिस्ट्रार, नूरपुर, जिला कांगड़ा (हि० प्र०)

उनवान मुकदमा:

श्री वीर बहादुर पुन श्री लाल बहादुर, निवासी गांव लोहारपुरा डाकघर सुल्माली, तहसील नूरपुर, जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश  
साथल।

बनाम

आम जनता

विषय.—प्रार्थना-पत्र वाचत किये जाने पंजीकृत वसीयतनामा जेर धारा 40-41 भारतीय पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1968।

नोटिस वनाम आम जनता।

आम जनता को आगाह किया जाता है कि मूल कीर बहादुर पुन श्री लाल बहादुर, निवासी लोहारपुरा, डाकघर सुल्माली, तहसील नूरपुर, जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश ने अपने जीते जी पूरे हांगा-हांगा से एक वसीयतनामा रुबह गवाहान लिखा है जिसमें इसने अपनी बल-प्रचल सम्पत्ति अपने भाई बाई बहादुर पुन श्री लाल बहादुर के नाम 26-1-2001 एक वसीयतनामा द्वारा लिख दी है। अब साथल अपने भाई बहादुर का मूल दिनांक 27-1-2001 के उपरान्त पंजीकृत करवाना चाहता है।

इसलिए इन इष्टतहार राजपत्र, हिमाचल प्रदेश द्वारा आम जनता का सुचित किया जाना है कि यदि वसीयतनामा पंजीकृण करने वारे कोई एताज/आपत्ति हो तो वे असालन या बकालतन दिनांक 31-7-2001 से पहले किसी कार्य दिवस वाले दिन या दिनांक 31-7-2001 को पेश कर सकत है। बाद मूलने मियाद वसीयतनामा नियमानुसार पंजीकृत कर दिया जावेगा।

आज दिनांक 25-6-2001 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

आर० बी० शाहिलया,  
तहसीलदार एवं अधिकारी  
उप-रजिस्ट्रार, नूरपुर,  
जिला कांगड़ा (हि० प्र०)।

In the Court of Senior Sub Judge, Kinnar at Reckong-Peо, Himachal Pradesh

Case No. 2/2 of 1999

Next Date of hearing : 1-8-2001

In case:—

Shrimati Bhajanti Devi wd/o late Shri Sein r/o Village Riba, Tehsil Moorang, District Kinnar, Himachal Pradesh  
...Petitioner.

Versus

General public

...Respondent.

Application under section 375 of Indian Succession Act, 1925 for the grant of Succession Certificate.

To

The general public.

Whereas in above noted case, the petitioner have filed the petition in this court for the grant of Succession Certificate and the same is fixed for 1-8-2001 for the service of general public.

Hence the proclamation under order 5, rule 20 (1-A) CPC is hereby issued against the above noted defendants/respondents to appear before this court on 1-8-2001 at 10.00 A.M. personally or through authorised agent or pleader to defend the case, failing which the above noted respondent shall be proceeded against *ex parte*.

Given under my hand and seal of this court on 28-5-2001.

Sd/-  
Seal.  
Senior Sub Judge,  
Kinnar at Reckong-Peо (H. P.).

इष्टतहार

नोटिस वनाम आम जनता।  
व अदालत उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी, कल्पा रियत रिकांग-पिथो जिला किन्नौर (हि० प्र०)

श्रीमती उमेद पति विधवा स्व० श्री दयाल चंद, ग्राम बूथा, तहसील सांगला, जिला किन्नौर (हि० प्र०)।

वनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्रीमती उमेद पति विधवा स्वर्गो श्री दयाल चन्द, ग्राम बुझा, तहसील सांगला, जिला किन्नौर (हि० प्र०) ने इस अदालत में जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 की धारा 13(3) के अन्तर्गत गुजारिश की है कि उसने अपने पति स्वर्गो श्री दयाल चन्द ग्राम बुझा की मृत्यु दिनांक 19-12-1999 का पंजीकरण ग्राम पंचायत बुझा के अभिलेख में दर्ज न करवाई है। प्रार्थिया ने इस अर्थात् का एक शपथ-पत्र भी आवेदन पत्र के साथ प्रस्तुत किया है तथा अनुरोध किया है कि अब प्रार्थिया के पति की मृत्यु दिनांक 19-12-1999 का इन्द्राज/पंजीकरण ग्राम पंचायत बुझा के अभिलेख में नियमानुसार दर्ज करने के निर्देश जारी किये जाएं।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस्तहार हजा के माध्यम से सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी भी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त भूतक की मृत्यु तिथि दिनांक 19-12-1999 के इन्द्राज/पंजीकरण पंचायत अभिलेख में करने वारे कोई आपत्ति/एतराज हो तो वह लिखित/मीडिक रूप से असालतन या वकालतन अदालत हजा में प्रस्तुत होकर दिनांक 21-8-2001 या इससे पूर्व प्रस्तुत करे अन्यथा यह समझा जाएगा कि प्रार्थी की पुत्री का नाम व जन्म तिथि ग्राम पंचायत कोठी में दर्ज करने वारे किसी को कोई आपत्ति न है। इस आधार पर नाम व जन्म तिथि दर्ज करने सम्बन्धी आदेश नियमानुसार पारित कर दिए।

आज दिनांक 28-6-2001 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/-  
उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी, कल्पा,  
स्थित रिकांग-पिंडो, जिला किन्नौर।

व अदालत उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी, कल्पा स्थित रिकांग-पिंडो, जिला किन्नौर (हि० प्र०)

श्री विद्या सागर सूद पुत्र स्वर्गीय श्री भगवान दास सूद, हाल दुकानदार रिकांग-पिंडो, तहसील कल्पा, जिला किन्नौर, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

वनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्री विद्या सागर सूद पुत्र स्वर्गीय श्री भगवान दास सूद, हाल दुकानदार रिकांग-पिंडो, तहसील कल्पा, जिला किन्नौर (हि० प्र०) ने इस अदालतन में जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 की धारा 13 (3) के अन्तर्गत गुजारिश की है कि उसने अपनी पुत्री का नाम व जन्म तिथि ग्राम पंचायत कोठी के अभिलेख में दर्ज न करवाई है। प्रार्थी ने इस आशय का एक शपथ-पत्र भी आवेदन-पत्र के साथ प्रस्तुत किया है तथा अनुरोध किया है कि अब प्रार्थी के निम्न पुत्र/पुत्री के नाम व जन्म तिथियां सम्बन्धित ग्राम पंचायत के अभिलेख में नियमानुसार दर्ज करने के आदेश जारी किए जाएं।

क्रम संखा ० नाम प्रार्थी के साथ सम्बन्ध जन्म तिथि

१. करिमा सूद पुत्री ३०-४-१९९१

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस्तहार हजा के माध्यम से सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी भी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त कल्पा में दर्ज/पंजीकरण करने वारे कोई आपत्ति/एतराज हो तो वह लिखित/मीडिक रूप से असालतन या वकालतन अदालत हजा में प्रस्तुत होकर दिनांक 21-8-2001 या इससे पूर्व प्रस्तुत करे अन्यथा यह समझा जाएगा कि प्रार्थी की पुत्री का नाम व जन्म तिथि ग्राम पंचायत कोठी में दर्ज करने वारे किसी को कोई आपत्ति न है। इस आधार पर नाम व जन्म तिथियां दर्ज करने सम्बन्धी आदेश नियमानुसार पारित कर दिए।

व जन्म तिथि पंचायत अभिलेख कोठी में वज्र/पंजीकरण करने वारे कोई आपत्ति/एतराज हो तो वह लिखित/मीडिक रूप से असालतन या वकालतन अदालत हजा में प्रस्तुत होकर दिनांक 21-8-2001 या इससे पूर्व प्रस्तुत करे अन्यथा यह समझा जाएगा कि प्रार्थी की पुत्री का नाम व जन्म तिथि ग्राम पंचायत कोठी में दर्ज करने वारे किसी को कोई आपत्ति न है। इस आधार पर नाम व जन्म तिथि दर्ज करने सम्बन्धी आदेश नियमानुसार पारित कर दिए।

आज दिनांक 7-7-2001 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत सहित जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/-  
उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी, कल्पा,  
स्थित रिकांग-पिंडो, जिला किन्नौर।

व अदालत उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी, कल्पा स्थित रिकांग-पिंडो, जिला किन्नौर (हि० प्र०)

श्री विद्या सागर सूद पुत्र स्वर्गीय श्री भगवान दास सूद, हाल दुकानदार रिकांग-पिंडो, तहसील कल्पा, जिला किन्नौर, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

वनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम 1969.

श्री विद्या सागर सूद पुत्र स्वर्गीय श्री भगवान दास सूद, हाल दुकानदार रिकांग-पिंडो, तहसील कल्पा, जिला किन्नौर (हि० प्र०) ने इस अदालत में जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 की धारा 13 (3) के अन्तर्गत गुजारिश की है कि उसने अपने निम्न पुत्र/पुत्री का नाम व जन्म तिथियां ग्राम पंचायत कल्पा के अभिलेख में दर्ज न करवाई है। प्रार्थी ने इस आशय का एक शपथ-पत्र भी आवेदन-पत्र के साथ प्रस्तुत किया है तथा अनुरोध किया है कि अब प्रार्थी के निम्न पुत्र/पुत्री के नाम व जन्म तिथियां सम्बन्धित ग्राम पंचायत के अभिलेख में नियमानुसार दर्ज करने के आदेश जारी किए जाएं।

क्रम संखा	नाम	प्रार्थी के साथ सम्बन्ध	जन्म तिथि
१.	अनुपमा सूद	पुत्री	३१-७-१९७५
२.	प्रदीप कुमार सूद	पुत्र	२९-३-१९७९

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस्तहार हजा के माध्यम से सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी भी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त कल्पा में दर्ज/पंजीकरण करने वारे कोई आपत्ति/एतराज हो तो वह लिखित/मीडिक रूप से असालतन या वकालतन अदालत हजा में प्रस्तुत होकर दिनांक 21-8-2001 या इससे पूर्व प्रस्तुत करे अन्यथा यह समझा जाएगा कि प्रार्थी की पुत्री का नाम व जन्म तिथि ग्राम पंचायत कल्पा में दर्ज करने वारे किसी को कोई एतराज न है। इस आधार पर नाम व जन्म तिथियां दर्ज करने सम्बन्धी आदेश नियमानुसार पारित कर दिए।

आज दिनांक 7-7-2001 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/-  
उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी, कल्पा स्थित रिकांग-पिंडो, जिला किन्नौर (हि० प्र०)।

व अदालत श्री सैन राम, कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, उप-तहसील आनी, जिला कुल्लू (हि० प्र०)

व मुकदमा :—

श्रीमती आशा देवी पत्नी उग्र नैन, निवासी धारा गोरा, डॉ धर धार, तहसील रामपुर बुँदूहर, जिला शिमला हाल निवासी तांछी, फाटी पलेही, कोठी हिमरी, उप तहसील आनी, जिला कुल्लू (हि० प्र०)।

प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्रीमती आशा देवी पत्नी उग्र नैन, हाल निवासी तांछी, फाटी पलेही, उप-तहसील आनी ने इस कार्यालय में निवेदन किया है कि उसके पुत्र विक्रम सिंह की जन्म तिथि 3-3-1996 सही है जो कि भूत्तचूक के कारण ग्राम पंचायत पलेही में दर्ज नहीं की गई है, जो दर्ज करना चाहिए।

अतः आम जनता को इस इश्तहार द्वारा सचित किया जाना है कि अगर इस बारे किसी को कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह दिनांक 31-7-2001 को इस न्यायालय में प्राप्त: 10.00 बजे असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर आवें। गैर-हाजीरी की सूरत में एक तरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जावेगी।

आज दिनांक 21-6-2001 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर सहित इस अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

सैन राम,  
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,  
उप-तहसील आनी, जिला कुल्लू (हि० प्र०)।

व अदालत श्री सैन राम, कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, उप-तहसील आनी, जिला कुल्लू (हि० प्र०)

व मुकदमा :

श्री कौल राम पुत्र जोवन दास, निवासी कण्डा आरन, फाटी शिल्ही, कोठी जांचा, उप-तहसील आनी, जिला कुल्लू (हि० प्र०)।

वनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्री कौल राम पुत्र जोवन दास, गांव कण्डा आरन, फाटी शिल्ही कोठी जांचा, उप-तहसील आनी ने इस न्यायालय में निवेदन किया है कि उसके पुत्र नौदीश की जन्म तिथि 31-12-1996 तथा पुत्री पूजा देवी को जन्म तिथि 11-5-1998 है जो कि भूत्तचूक के कारण ग्राम पंचायत रोपा में दर्ज नहीं की गई है, जो कि दर्ज करना चाहिए।

अतः आम जनता को इस इश्तहार द्वारा सचित किया जाता है कि अगर इस बारे किसी को कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह दिनांक 31-7-2001 को इस न्यायालय में प्राप्त: 10.00 बजे असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर आवें। गैर-हाजीरी की सूरत में एक तरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जावेगी।

आज दिनांक 21-6-2001 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर सहित इस अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

सैन राम,  
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,  
उप-तहसील आनी, जिला कुल्लू (हि० प्र०)।

इश्तहार

व अदालत श्री धर्म सिंह ठाकुर, सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी (तहसीलदार), जिला लाहौल एवं स्पिति, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्री प्रेम चन्द पुत्र श्री गंगदास, गांव गांव, कोठी जोवनग, जिला लाहौल एवं स्पिति (हि० प्र०)।

वनाम

सरकार/ग्राम जनता

विषय.—इश्तहारन वगये नाम तब्दीनी।

हल्कत व्याप्त एवं आवेदन-पत्र श्री प्रेम चन्द पुत्र श्री गंगदास, गांव रापे, काली जोवनग, जिला लाहौल एवं स्पिति, (हि० प्र०) ने आवेदन किया है कि उसके पुत्र का नाम हीरोन स्कूल एवं पंचायत रिकांड में दर्ज किया गया है जिसे वह बदल कर महेन्द्र निह रखना चाहता है तथा हीरोन की जन्म तारीख 16-6-89 है।

अतः जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम 1969 के तहत हीरोन का नाम बदल कर महेन्द्र सिंह किया जाए एवं तारीख पैदाई 16-6-1989 का इन्द्राज किया जाए के बारा किसी को कोई उजर/प्रसराज हो तो वह असालतन व वकालतन हाजिर अदालत दिनांक 3-8-2001 को पेश होंगे अन्यथा यकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 3-7-2001 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

धर्म सिंह ठाकुर,  
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी (तहसीलदार),  
लाहौल स्थान केलंग, जिला लाहौल एवं स्पिति (हि० प्र०)।

इश्तहार

व अदालत श्री धर्म सिंह ठाकुर, सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी (तहसीलदार) लाहौल, जिला लाहौल एवं स्पिति, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्रीमती फृत्त्वोक डोलमा विधवा पाल सिंह पुत्र सनम छेरिंग, गांव व कोठी गौशाल।

वनाम

1. विजे सिंह पुत्र सनम छेरिंग पुत्र काहन दास, 2. सुखदास पुत्र काहन दास, 3. देवी सिंह पुत्र प्रेम दास पुत्र काहन दास, 4. मोहर चन्द, 5. प्रीतम सिंह, 6. रामकृष्ण पुत्र गणसुख दियाल पुत्र पंछी राम, 7. प्रेमनाथ पुत्र पंछी राम, 8. रामनाथ पुत्र रूपचन्द, निवासी गौशाल, तहसील लाहौल।

मिसल नं० (2)

उपरोक्त

मुकदमा तकसीम भूमि तादादी खसरा नं० 701, 762, 698, 700, 702, कित्ता 5, रुक्का 5-15 बीघा मैदानी खाता खतोनी नं० 69/96, 97 जमा माल 1.28 पैसे जमावन्दी साल 1991-92 दाक्षा गांव व कोठी गौशाल, तहसील लाहौल, जिला लाहौल एवं स्पिति, एवं मिसल नं० 2 तकसीम भूमि रकवा तादादी 13-10 बीघा खसरा नं० 699, 763, 763/1, कित्ता 3 खाता खतोनी नं० 67/94 जमा माल 0.21 पैसे जमावन्दी साल 1991-92 दाक्षा गांव व कोठी गौशाल, जिला लाहौल स्पिति (हि० प्र०)।

उपरोक्त मुकदमा तकसीम में प्रतिवादीगण को इस अदालत द्वारा कई बार समन जारी किया गया परन्तु तामील न हो सका। अतः अदालत की संतुल्यी के लिए यह सिद्ध हो चका है कि उपरोक्त प्रतिवादीगण को साइराण तरीके से तामील नहीं हो सकती है। अतः जेर धारा 126 हिमाचल प्रदेश भू० राजस्व अधिनियम के तहत प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग

करते हुए राजपत्र हिमाचल प्रदेश के माध्यम से समस्त प्रतिवादियों एवं संसद कानून को सुचित किया जाता है कि अगर उपरोक्त तकसीम बारा किसी को कोई उजर व एतराज हो तो वह असालतन या बकालतन हाजिर आकर पैरवी करे। पैरवी की तारीख 3-8-2001 को सुनिश्चित की गई है। अनुपस्थिति की अवस्था में वह समझा जाएगा कि किसी को भी इस बारे कोई उजर व एतराज न है तथा यकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 3-7-2001 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व न्यायालय की मुद्रिका सहित जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

धर्म सिंह ठाकर,  
सहायक समाहृती (नहसीलदार),  
लाहौल स्थान केलंग, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

इश्तहार

व अदालत श्री धर्म सिंह ठाकर, सहायक समाहृती प्रथम, श्रीणी (नहसीलदार), लाहौल स्थान केलंग, जिला लाहौल एवं स्पिति, हिमाचल प्रदेश

राजू पुत्र नवांग लेरिंग, गांव केलंग, कोठी गुमरंग

वनाम

सरकार/आम जनता

विवर।—नाम दर्ज (जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण) करवाने वारे।

आवेदक राजू पुत्र नवांग लेरिंग ने आवेदन-पत्र सहित हल्किया व्यापार पेश किया है कि उनके पिता लेरिंग की मृत्यु सेना में कार्य करते हुए हो गई है। जिसकी मृत्यु वारे पंचायत अभिलेख एवं राजस्व अभिलेख में कोई भी इन्द्राजन न हुआ है।

अन: जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 नवांग लेरिंग की मृत्यु पंचायत अभिलेख एवं राजस्व अभिलेख में दर्ज करवाने वारे अगर किसी को कोई उजर व एतराज हो तो वह असालतन व बकालतन हाजिर अदालत दिनांक 3-8-2001 को पेश होवे अन्यथा यकनरका कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 3-7-2001 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

धर्म सिंह ठाकर,  
सहायक समाहृती प्रथम श्रीणी,  
लाहौल स्थान केलंग, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

## PROCLAMATION

Before Shri Varinder Sharma, Executive Magistrate  
Tehsil Padhar, District Mandi (H. P.)

In the matter of :

Shri Lekh Ram s/o Shri Devi Ram, r/o Gawahani,  
Tehsil Padhar, District Mandi, Himachal Pradesh  
... Applicant.

Versus

General public ... Respondent.

Petition for birth registration u/s 13(3) Birth and Death Registration Act, 1969.

Whereas, the petitioner Lekh Ram s/o Sh. Devi Ram, r/o Gawahani, P. O. Padwahan, Tehsil Padhar has moved an application to the facts that his date of birth in the Gram Panchayat concerned Baridhar is recorded only 48 years as of 1995 and has sought the relief that his date of birth may be ordered to be recorded as 4-9-1948 in the concerned CPanchayat.

Whereas, the general public has been made as respondent and the undersigned has come to the satisfaction that the service upon the general public cannot be effected ordinarily. Now this proclamation is hereby issued u/o 5, rule 20, CPC and called the general public for filing the objections if any, to the petition applied for on or before the 28-7-2001 at 10.00 A. M. before the undersigned, failing which an *ex parte* order shall be passed and case would be disposed of accordingly.

Given under my hand and seal of the court today on this 28th day of June, 2001.

Seal.

VARINDER SHARMA,  
Executive Magistrate,  
Tehsil Padhar, District Mandi (H. P.).

## PROCLAMATION

Before Shri Varinder Sharma, Executive Magistrate  
Tehsil Padhar, District Mandi (H. P.)

In the matter of :

Shri Santu s/o Hirda, r/o Kufri, Tehsil Padhar,  
District Mandi (H. P.) .. Petitioner.

Versus

General public

.. Respondent.

An application for birth registration u/s 13(3) of Birth and Death Registration Act, 1969.

Whereas, the petitioner Santu s/o Hirda, r/o Kufri, Tehsil Padhar has moved an application u/s 13(3) of Birth and Death Registration Act, 1969 for his birth registration specifically as his date of birth is recorded only years 1949 which has caused the great obstruction to its necessity where falls.

Whereas, the general public has been made as respondent and undersigned has also come to the satisfaction that general public can't be summoned through an ordinarily service and hence this proclamation u/o 5, rule 20, CPC is hereby issued and called the general public to come up on 28-7-2001 at 10.00 A.M. to file the objections if any to the contents of the petition on or before the date mentioned above failing which an *ex parte* order shall be passed and the case would be taken up accordingly.

Given under my hand and seal of the court today on this 28th day of June, 2001.

Seal.

VARINDER SHARMA,  
Executive Magistrate,  
Tehsil Padhar, District Mandi (H.P.).

## PROCLAMATION

Before Shri Varinder Sharma, Executive Magistrate,  
Tehsil Padar, District Mandi (H. P.)

In the matter of :

Kanhy Ram s/o Chananu Ram r/o Bari Bajgan  
.. Petitioner.

Versus

General public

.. Respondent.

Petition for birth registration u/s 13(3) of Birth & Death Registration Act, 1969.

Whereas, the petitioner Kanhy Ram s/o Channu Ram, r/o Bari Bajgan has moved an application duly supported by an affidavit u/s 13(3) of Birth & Death

Registration Act, 1969 with the contents that the date of birth in the panchayat records is recorded only 1967 whereas his date of birth contents be specifically mentioning therein day & month and therefore has prayed for the same by moving present application.

Whereas the general public has been made as respondent & undersigned has come to the satisfaction that the service upon general public cannot be got effect through an ordinary service and have this proclamation is issued u/o 5, rule 20, CPC & called the general public for filing objections, if any, to the contents of the petition on or before 31-7-2001 at 10.00 A. M. before the undersigned failing which an *ex parte* order shall be passed & case would be disposed off accordingly.

Given under my hand & seal of the court today on this 2nd day of July, 2001.

Seal.

**VARINDER SHARMA,**  
*Executive Magistrate,*  
*Tehsil Padhar, District Mandi (H.P.).*

Before Shri Varinder Sharma, Executive Magistrate, Tehsil Padhar, District Mandi, Himachal Pradesh

In the matter of :

Fagnu Ram s/o Mangnu Ram, r/o Dhamchyan  
...Petitioner.

*Versus*

General public

... Respondent

Petition for birth registration u/s 13(3) of Birth & Death Registration Act, 1969.

Whereas, the petitioner Fagnu Ram s/o Mangnu Ram, r/o Dhamchyan, Tehsil Padhar has moved an application u/s 13 (3) of Birth & Death Registration Act for his birth registration duly supported *vide* an affidavit to the facts that his date of birth is not specified in accurate day & months but that is only year 1962 which is against the fact whereas the date of birth is claimed to have been 18-2-1962 which is sought to be ordered to register in Panchayat concerned.

Whereas the general public has been made as respondent by the petitioner & petitioner has come to the satisfaction that service upon the general public can not be got effect ordinarily and whereas this proclamation u/o 5, rule 20, CPC is hereby issued and called the general public for filing the objections if any to the contents of the petition on or before 31-7-2001 at 10.00 A.M. before the undersigned failing which an *ex parte* order shall be passed and case would be decided accordingly.

Given under my hand and seal of the court today the 2nd day of July, 2001.

Seal.

**VARINDER SHARMA,**  
*Executive Magistrate,*  
*Tehsil Padhar, District Mandi (H.P.).*

Before Shri Varinder Sharma, Executive Magistrate, Tehsil Padhar, District Mandi (H. P.)

In the matter of :

Karam Singh s/o Bhutaku Ram, r/o Kuljhan.  
...Petitioner.

*Versus*

General public

... Respondent.

An application u/s 13(3) of Birth and Death Registration Act, 1969 for Birth Registration.

Whereas, the petitioner Karam Singh s/o Bhutaku r/o Kuljhan, Post Office Bardhan, Tehsil Padhar has moved an application u/s 13(3) of Birth and Death Registration Act, 1969 with the contents that his date of birth in the Register concerned is registered only year 1966 whereas there is not month and date mentioned by the concerned panchayat and therefore moved the application for making order to register the specific day and month duly supported by an affidavit.

Hence the general public has been made as respondent and undersigned has also come to the satisfaction that the service upon general public cannot be got effected through an ordinary modes and hence this proclamation u/o 5, rule 20, CPC is hereby issued to called the general public for filing the objections of any to the contents of the petition on or before 31-7-2001 at 10.00 A. M. before the undersigned, failing which an *ex parte* order shall be passed against the absentee and the case would be dealt with likewise.

Given under my hand and Seal of the court today this 2nd day of July, 2001.

Seal.

**VARINDER SHARMA,**  
*Executive Magistrate,*  
*Tehsil Padhar,*  
*District Mandi, (H.P.).*

इंशहार

व अदान्त श्री गन ० एल ० वडेन, नहमीलदार एवं महायक समाहर्ता  
प्रथम श्रेणी, सरकारी, जिला मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश

व मुकदमा :

श्री चेत राम युन राम दिना, निवासी कलग, डाकघर सरकारी  
तंहमील सरकारी, जिला मण्डी (हि ० प्र०) प्रार्थी।

वनाम

ग्राम जनता

विषय.—प्रार्थना-पत्र जात एवं गोत मुताबिक इन्द्राज नकल जमावन्दी  
1961-6-2 दर्ज करने वारे।

उपरोक्त प्रार्थी ने हमारे समझ एक प्रार्थना-पत्र इस आशय में  
प्रस्तुत किया है कि 1961-6-2 नकल शजरा नस्व में लुहार थी  
लेकिन बन्दोबस्त के दौरान प्रार्थी के पिता श्री राम दिना की जानि  
पटवारी के रिकाई में धीमान शक्ति कर दी गई थी। प्रार्थी ने  
दोनों नकल शजरा नशव आमिल की है। प्रार्थी राजस्व अभिलेख  
में दलती करवाना चाहता है। अतः ग्राम जनता को इस इंशहार  
द्वारा सुचित किया जाता है कि प्रार्थी की जाति लुहार दर्ज करने  
में किसी को आपत्ति हो तो वह दिनांक 2-8-2001 को प्रातः  
दस बजे असालतन या बकालतन हाजिर आकर उजर/एतराज पेश कर  
सकते हैं अन्यथा नियमानुसार कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जायेगी।

मोहर ।

गन ० एल ० वडेन,  
समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,  
सरकारी, जिला मण्डी,  
हिमाचल प्रदेश।

व अदालत श्री एन० एल० वर्धन, तहसीलदार एवं सहायक समाहृता  
प्रथम श्रेणी, सरकारी घट, जिला मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश

व मुकदमा :

व्यास देव पुत्र काली दास, निवासी हरी, इलाका मुरांगा, तहसील  
सरकारी घट, जिला मण्डी (हि० प्र०)

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थी ।

विषय.—प्रार्थना-पत्र नाम की दस्ती हेतु ।

उपरोक्त प्रार्थी ने एक प्रार्थना-पत्र इस आशय से प्रस्तुत किया है कि प्रार्थी का नाम राजस्व अभिलेख में देव दर्ज है जबकि पाठ्याला के रिकांड में व्यास देव दर्ज है। प्रार्थी ने दरखास्त के साथ नकल परिवार रजिस्टर व नकल शजरा नशव व छाया प्रति नकल भूतपूर्व सैनिक का पहचान-पत्र संलग्न कर रखे हैं। प्रार्थी राजस्व अभिलेख में अपना नाम दस्त करवाना चाहता है। अतः आम जनता को इस इन्हारा द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि व्यास देव जिसका नाम राजस्व अभिलेख में देव दर्ज है कि दस्ती बारे किसी को आपति हो तो वह दिनांक 1-8-2001 को प्रातः दस बजे अदालतन या वकालतन अदालतन में हाजिर आकर उजर/एतराज पेश कर सकते हैं। अन्यथा कार्यवाही नियमानुसार अमल में लाई जायगी।

हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से आज दिनांक  
को जारी हुआ ।

मोहर ।

एन० एल० वर्धन,  
सहायक समाहृता प्रथम श्रेणी,  
सरकारी घट, जिला मण्डी (हि० प्र०) ।

व अदालत श्री एन० एल० वर्धन, तहसीलदार एवं सहायक समाहृता  
प्रथम श्रेणी, सरकारी घट, जिला मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश

व मुकदमा :

श्री सन्त राम पुत्र देवी सिंह, गांव वेरा, इलाका भद्रीहता, तहसील  
सरकारी घट, जिला मण्डी (हि० प्र०)

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थी ।

विषय.—प्रार्थना-पत्र जात एवं गोत मुनाबिक इन्द्राज दर्ज करने  
वारे जेर आडर 5, नियम 20, सी० पी० मी० ।

उपरोक्त प्रार्थी ने हमारे समक्ष एक प्रार्थना-पत्र इस आशय से प्रस्तुत किया है कि नकल शजरा नशव में उनकी जाति का इन्द्राज बाह्यण घाट गंगे दौरान बन्दोवस्त दर्ज कागजात माल किया गया है आवेदक ने नकल शजरा नशव भी जागिल किया है। प्रार्थी राजस्व अभिलेख में दस्ती करवाना चाहता है। अतः आम जनता को इस इन्हारा द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि प्रार्थी की जाति बाह्यण घाट गंगे के बजाये बाह्यण घाट दर्ज करने में किसी को आपति हो तो वह दिनांक 1-8-2001 को प्रातः दस बजे अदालतन या वकालतन हाजिर उजर/एतराज पेश कर सकते हैं। अन्यथा इस मामले में यक्तरका कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जायगी।

आज दिनांक 19-6-2001 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ ।

मोहर ।

एन० एल० वर्धन,  
सहायक समाहृता प्रथम श्रेणी,  
सरकारी घट, जिला मण्डी (हि० प्र०) ।

व अदालत श्री विजय चन्दन, उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी, सुन्दरनगर,  
जिला मण्डी (हि० प्र०)

व मुकदमा :

श्री मनी राम पुत्र श्री शिव राम, निवासी डडोह, डाकखाना अपर  
बैहली, तहसील सुन्दरनगर, जिला मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश ।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रतिवादी ।

प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण  
अधिनियम, 1969.

उपरोक्त मुकदमा में श्री मनी राम प्रार्थी ने दिनांक 29-6-2001 को इस अदालत में एक प्रार्थना-पत्र पेश किया है कि उससे पिता शिव राम पुत्र श्री जबू राम की मृत्यु दिनांक 10-4-2000 को उसके निवास स्थान पर हुई थी लेकिन समय पर उनकी मृत्यु तिथि ग्राम पंचायत अपर बैहली में दर्ज नहीं करवाई है। अब दर्ज करने के आदेश जारी किये जावे ।

अतः आम जनता को इस इन्हारा के द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को इस बारा कोई उजर/एतराज हो तो वह पेश दिनांक 3-8-2001 समय 10.00 बजे सुबह या इसमें पूर्व असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर अदालत होकर पेश करें अन्यथा दीगर कार्यवाही एक तरफा अमल में लाई जावेगी ।

आज दिनांक  
अदालत से जारी हुआ ।

को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर

मोहर ।

विजय चन्दन,  
उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी, सुन्दरनगर,  
जिला मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश ।

व अदालत श्री बी० आर० सरोज, कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, जुब्बल  
जिला शिमला, हिमाचल प्रदेश

व मुकदमा :

श्री रमेश पुत्र कुम्भ दास, निवासी सोलंग, तहसील जुब्बल, जिला  
शिमला (हि० प्र०)

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रतिवादी ।

प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 के अन्तर्गत जन्म तिथि दर्ज करने कार्य ।

उपरोक्त मुकदमा में श्री रमेश कुम्भ प्रार्थी ने दिनांक 16-6-2001 को इस कार्यालय/अदालत में प्रार्थना-पत्र पेश किया है कि उसके जुड़वा पुत्र मनाज का जन्म दिनांक 12-3-1996 व रहुल का जन्म दिनांक 12-3-1996 को याम सोलंग, तहसील जुब्बल, जिला शिमला (हि० प्र०) में हुआ है। लेकिन समय पर उनकी जन्म तिथि ग्राम पंचायत सोलंग के अभिलेख में दर्ज नहीं करवाई जा सकी है। इसलिए अब दर्ज करने के लिए इस अदालत में आवेदन कर रखा है।

अतः आम जनता को इस इन्हारा द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी भी व्यक्ति को इस बारा कोई उजर व एतराज आदि

हो तो वह तारीख ऐसी दिनों 28-7-2001 को ममत दस बजे सुबह या इससे दूर्व असालतन/वकालतन हाजर अदालत आकर पेश कर सकता है। इसके उपरान किसी किस्म का कोई एतराज माल्यन होगा और आवेदन-पत्र के मताविक आवेदक के बच्चे की जन्म तिथियां पंचायत अधिलेख में दर्ज करने के आवेदन नियानुसार प्रदान किए जायेंगे।

आज दिनांक 16-6-2001 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

बी 10 आर० भोज,  
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, ज़ब्दल,  
जिला शिमला, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

In the Court of District Judge, Kinnaur, Civil Division  
at Rampur Bushahr (H. P.)

Application No. I-R/5 of 2001

In re :

Shri Jai Singh son of late Sh. Uma Cherring, aged 21 years, resident of Village Panvi, Tehsil Nichar, District Kinnaur (H. P.) ..Applicant.

Versus

General public

Application under section 10 of the Guardians and Wards Act, 1890 for the appointment of guardian of person and property of the minors Kalam Singh and Madan Lal.

Notice to :

The general public.

Whereas in the aforesaid case, application under Section 10 of the Guardians and Wards Act, 1890 has been moved by the above named applicant for the appointment of guardian of the person and property of the minors Kalam Singh and Madan Lal, both his younger brothers, in respect of two roomed house and land situated in Up-Mohal Phakrodar dhar in village Panvi in Kinnaur District bearing Khata Khatoni No. 42/101, Khasra No. 123 and 124, Measuring 0-07-03 and 0-05-92 hecta., respectively and land situated in Up-Mohal Vurcha in village Panyi bearing Khata Khatoni No. 48/96, Khasra Nos. 217 and 218, measuring 0-07-20 hecta. and 0-16-83 hecta. respectively to the extent of one third share, as well as to produce the guardianship certificate before the concerned Himachal Pradesh State Electricity Board's office to receive the payment of D. C. R. G., payable to the minors, in respect of late Shri Uma Cherring, who was an employee in H. P. S. E. B. and who died on 3-12-1999. The next date for hearing of the aforesaid application has been fixed 1-8-2001 by this Court.

Hence, this proclamation is hereby issued to the general public to appear and oppose the aforesaid application by filing objection (s), if any, as to why this petition be not allowed, personally or through an authorised agent/pleader on or before 1-8-2001, failing which the application will be heard and disposed of *ex parte*.

Given under my hand and the seal of the Court today this 18th day of June, 2001.

Seal.

Sd/-  
District Judge,  
Kinnaur Division at Rampur Bushahr (H.P.).

In the Court of Shri S. L. Saini, Collector, Sub Division Rohru, District Shimla, Himachal Pradesh

Case No. 58/98

In case:

Chinta Devi wd/o Thakur Sain, r/o Village Banoti, Tehsil Chirgaon, District Shimla .. Petitioner.

Versus

1. Shri Rajesh Kumar s/o Inder Singh, r/o Village Banoti, Tehsil Chirgaon ..Principal Respondent.

2. Shri Raj Kumar s/o Thakur Sain, 3. Shusheela Devi, 4. Babita Devi, 5. Suresh Kumar, all sons and daughter of Thakur Sain minors through natural guardian Shrimati Chinta Devi wd/o Thakur Sain, r/o Village Banoti, Tehsil Chirgaon, District Shimla, Himachal Pradesh .. Performa Respondents.

Petition u/s 17 of Himachal Pradesh Land Revenue Act with a prayer to call for the mutation proceedings of late Shri Thakur Sain *vide* mutation No. 37 dated 21-5-1998 and to set aside the same since the same has been attested on illegal notion ignoring the law of succession.

Notice to:  
Respondent No. 1.

Whereas in the above notcd case it has been proved to the satisfaction of this court that above named respondent No. 1 is avoiding the service of summon and cannot be served in the ordinary way. Hence this proclamation is hereby issued against him to appear in this court on 30-7-2001 at 10.00 A.M. to defend the case personally or through an authorised agent or pleader failing which *ex parte* proceedings will be taken against him.

Given under my hand and seal of the court this 8th day of June, 2001.

Seal.

S. L. SAINI,  
Collector Sub Division Rohru,  
District Shimla (H. P.).

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH  
AT SHIMLA

ORIGINAL JURISDICTION

In the matter of the Companies Act, 1956.

and

In the matter of Surya Pharmaceutical Ltd. (Transferee Company), a company incorporated under the Companies Act, 1956 having its Registered Office at 85, HPSICD Industrial Area, Baddi, District Solan, Himachal Pradesh.

and

In the matter of scheme of amalgamation of Surya Pharmaceutical Ltd., having its Registered Office at 85, HPSICD Industrial Area, Baddi, District Solan, Himachal Pradesh (Transferee Company), and Sam Biotech Ltd., having its Registered Office at Village Banur, Tehsil Rajpura (Punjab) (Transferor Company).

Company Petition No. 4 of 2001

NOTICE OF HEARING

A petition under Section 394 of the Companies Act, 1956 for amalgamation of Surya Pharmaceutical Ltd. (Transferee Company), and Sam Biotech Ltd. (Transferee Company) was presented by Surya Pharmaceutical Ltd., on 29-01-2001 and the said petition is fixed

or hearing before the Company Judge on Monday, the 6th day of August, 2001. Any person desirous of supporting or opposing the said petition should send to the petitioner's Advocate, Shri Kapil Dev Sood, notice of his intention, signed by him or his Advocate, with his name and address, so as to reach Shri Kapil Dev Sood, Advocate not later than 2 days before the date fixed for the hearing of the petition. Where he seeks to oppose the petition the grounds of opposition or copy of the affidavit shall be furnished with such notice. Copy of the petition will be furnished by the petitioner to any person requiring the same on payment of the prescribed charges for the same.

**KAPIL DEV SOOD,**  
(Advocate for the Petitioner).  
Dalziel Lodge, Behind SBI Main Branch,  
The Mall, Shimla-171 003 (H. P.).

ब अदालत श्री राजेश शर्मा, उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी (ग्रा०)  
शिमला, जिला शिमला (हि० प्र०)

श्रीमती विमला देवी पत्नी श्री पूर्ण चत्व, निवासी ग्राम घाटडू  
डा० ममरहिल, तहसील ब जिला शिमला (हि० प्र०)।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्रीमती विमला देवी ने इस अदालत में एक आवेदन-पत्र इस आशय के साथ गुजारा है कि उसके बेटे विजय कुमार का नाम ब जन्म तिथि 8-1-1996 उनकी ग्राम पंचायत नेहरी के अभिलेख में दर्ज नहीं कर रखी है, जो अब दर्ज की जावे।

अतः इस अदालती इश्तहार द्वारा सर्वसाधारण को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को भी उक्त आवेदिका के बेटे का जन्म व जन्म तिथि उनकी ग्राम पंचायत नेहरी के अभिलेख में दर्ज करने में कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह अपना आपत्तिनामा दिनांक 31-7-2001 तक या उससे पूर्व इस अदालत में हाजिर होकर प्रस्तुत कर सकता है, अन्यथा सचिव ग्राम पंचायत सम्बन्धित को नाम व जन्म तिथि उनकी पंचायत के अभिलेख में दर्ज करने के आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएं।

आज दिनांक 30-6-2001 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत सहित जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

राजेश शर्मा,  
उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी,  
शिमला (ग्रा०), जिला शिमला (हि० प्र०)।

ब अदालत श्री राजेश शर्मा, उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी (ग्रा०), शिमला जिला शिमला (हि० प्र०)

श्रीमती कमला देवी पत्नी स्वर्गीय श्रीम प्रकाश उर्फ भूमि प्रकाश, निवासी गांव फ्रमोग धरोगड़ा, परगना सराज, तहसील मुन्ही, जिला शिमला, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 वावत नाम व जन्म तिथि पंचायत अभिलेख में दर्ज करने वारे।

श्रीमती कमला देवी ने इस अदालत में एक आवेदन-पत्र इस आशय के साथ गुजारा है कि उसके पति श्री श्रीम प्रकाश उर्फ भूमि प्रकाश का नाम उनकी ग्राम पंचायत धरोगड़ा के अभिलेख में दर्ज नहीं कर रखी है, जो अब दर्ज किया जावे।

अतः इस अदालती इश्तहार द्वारा सर्वसाधारण को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को भी उक्त आवेदिका के पति का नाम उनकी ग्राम पंचायत धरोगड़ा के अभिलेख में दर्ज करने में कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह अपना आपत्तिनामा दिनांक 31-7-2001 तक या उससे पूर्व इस अदालत में हाजिर होकर प्रस्तुत कर सकता है अन्यथा सचिव ग्राम पंचायत सम्बन्धित को नाम उनकी ग्राम पंचायत के अभिलेख में दर्ज करने के आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएं।

आज दिनांक 30-6-2001 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर एवं मोहर अदालत सहित जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

राजेश शर्मा,  
उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी शिमला (ग्रा०),  
जिला शिमला (हि० प्र०)।

ब अदालत श्री राजेश शर्मा, उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी, शिमला (ग्रा०), जिला शिमला, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्री रूप लाल पुत्र श्री लच्छू राम, निवासी बगैं, तहसील मुन्ही, जिला शिमला, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर-धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 वावत नाम व शादी पंचायत अभिलेख में दर्ज करने वारे।

श्री रूप लाल ने इस अदालत में एक आवेदन-पत्र इस आशय के साथ गुजारा है कि उसकी पत्नी श्रीमती चन्द्रावती का नाम व शादी की तिथि 10-8-1999 उनकी ग्राम पंचायत शकरोड़ी के अभिलेख में दर्ज नहीं कर रखी है, जो अब दर्ज की जावे।

अतः इस अदालती इश्तहार द्वारा सर्वसाधारण को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को भी उक्त आवेदक की पत्नी का नाम व शादी की तिथि उनकी ग्राम पंचायत शकरोड़ी के अभिलेख में दर्ज करने में कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह अपना आपत्तिनामा दिनांक 30-7-2001 तक या उससे पूर्व इस अदालत में हाजिर होकर प्रस्तुत कर सकता है अन्यथा सचिव ग्राम पंचायत शकरोड़ी को नाम व शादी की तिथि उनकी पंचायत के अभिलेख में दर्ज करने के आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएं।

आज दिनांक 30-6-2001 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत सहित जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

राजेश शर्मा,  
उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी, शिमला (ग्रा०),  
जिला शिमला, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

ब अदालत श्री राजेश शर्मा, उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी (ग्रा०), शिमला, जिला शिमला, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्री जय किशन पुत्र श्री वालक राम, निवासी गांव कत्त्वान, तहसील एवं जिला शिमला, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा (13) 3 जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 वावत नाम व जन्म तिथि पंचायत अभिलेख में दर्ज करने वारे।

श्री जय किशन ने इस अदालत में एक आवेदन-पत्र इस आशय के साथ गुजारा है कि उसके बेटे सुनील कुमार का नाम व जन्म तिथि 3-6-1995, उनकी ग्राम पंचायत आनन्दपुर के अभिलेख में दर्ज नहीं कर रखी है, जो अब दर्ज की जावे।

अतः इस अदालती इश्तहार द्वारा सर्वसाधारण को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को भी उत्तर आवेदक के देटे के नाम व जन्म तिथि उनकी ग्राम पंचायत अमरपुर के अभिलेख में दर्ज करने में कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह अपना आपत्तिनामा दिनांक 31-7-2001 तक या उससे पूर्व इस अदालत में हाजिर होकर प्रस्तुत कर सकता है अन्यथा सचिव ग्राम पंचायत सम्बन्धित को नाम व जन्म तिथि उनकी पंचायत के अभिलेख में दर्ज करने के आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे ।

आज दिनांक 30-6-2001 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत सहित जारी हुआ ।

मोहर ।

राजेश शर्मा,  
उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी, शिमला (प्र०),  
जिला शिमला, हिमाचल प्रदेश ।

व अदालत श्री राकेश शर्मा (हि० प्र० मे०), उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी नाहन, जिला सिरमोर, हिमाचल प्रदेश

व मुकदमा :

श्री रमेश चन्द पुत्र श्री तेज राम, निवासी ग्राम मात्तर, तहसील नाहन, जिला सिरमोर, हिमाचल प्रदेश ।

बनाम

आम जनता

नोटिस बनाम आम जनता ।

श्री रमेश चन्द पुत्र श्री तेज राम, निवासी ग्राम मात्तर, तहसील नाहन, जिला सिरमोर ने दरकारात्मक गुजारी है कि उपके पुत्र का नाम अमनदीप शर्मा है परन्तु गलती से उसका नाम ग्राम पंचायत मात्तर के रिकार्ड में कुण्ड दत्त दर्ज करा दिया गया है जिसकी दूरस्ती ग्राम पंचायत के रिकार्ड में करवाना चाहता है ।

प्रार्थी श्री रमेश चन्द का आवेदन-पत्र ग्राम पंचायत एवं विकास अधिकारी, मात्तर को रिपोर्ट हेतु भेजा गया था जिसने अपनी रिपोर्ट में पुष्टि की है कि श्री रमेश चन्द के पुत्र का नाम ग्राम पंचायत के रिकार्ड में कुण्ड दत्त दर्ज किया गया है ।

अतः इस नोटिस द्वारा समस्त जनता ग्राम मात्तर व प्रार्थी श्री रमेश चन्द के रिकार्डों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को भी श्री रमेश चन्द के पुत्र अमनदीप शर्मा के नाम की दूरस्ती करने में कोई उजर/एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 30 जुलाई, 2001 प्रातः 10,00 बजे तक अदालत हजा रित्यनाहन में असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर आकर दर्ज करा सकता है । निर्धारित अवधि तक कोई आपत्ति प्राप्त न होने पर प्रार्थना-पत्र श्री रमेश चन्द पर नियमानुसार कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जायेगी ।

आज दिनांक 5 जुलाई, 2001 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर एवं कार्यालय मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया ।

मोहर ।

राजेश शर्मा,  
उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी,  
नाहन, जिला शिमला,  
हिमाचल प्रदेश ।

व अदालत श्री डी० आर० वर्मा, सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी (तहसीलदार), नाहन, हिमाचल प्रदेश

मिसल नं० 60/आर० 2001 दावा सेहत इन्द्राज राजस्व कागजात

नगर पालिका, नाहन, जिला सिरमोर, हिमाचल प्रदेश ..प्रार्थी ।

बनाम

सन्त राम पुत्र राम सिंह पुत्र नामालूम, निवासी अमरपुर, शहर नाहन, तहसील नाहन, हिमाचल प्रदेश ..प्रार्थी ।

नोटिस बनाम आम जनता ।

दरबारात्मक सेहत इन्द्राज भूमि बाता नं० 425 मिन, खत्तीनी ०७२४, खसरा नम्बर १३१५, नादादी रकवा १३६-६० वर्ग मीटर, वाका महाल अमरपुर शहर नाहन, तहसील नाहन, हिमाचल प्रदेश ।

नगरपालिका नाहन, शहर नाहन, तहसील नाहन, जिला सिरमोर, हिमाचल प्रदेश ने इस अदालत में प्रार्थना-पत्र दिया है कि अराजी खाता/खत्तीनी नम्बर ४२५ मिन/७२४, खसरा नम्बर १३१५ नादादी रकवा १३६-६० वर्गमीटर वाका महाल अमरपुर शहर नाहन से प्रतिवादी श्री मन्त राम पुत्र श्री राम चिह्न, निवासी महाल अमरपुर शहर नाहन का इन्द्राज जो बतार किरायेदार जमावन्दी वर्ष १९९६-९७ तक दज चला आ रहा है, को खारिज किया जाए, तकि वार्दी द्वारा आवेदन में स्पष्ट किया गया है कि इस समय भूमि बादग्रहन पर नगरपालिका का कट्टा है और प्रतिवादी यहां पर निवास नहीं कर रहा है । प्रतिवादी को इस अदालत द्वारा समन प्रेषित किया गया जो इस आध्य की रिपोर्ट के साथ वापिस प्राप्त हुआ है कि प्रतिवादी कई साल में लापदा है । अतः इस इश्तहार द्वारा प्रतिवादी व आम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि प्रतिवादी या आम जनता को कोई उजर/व एतराज नहीं तो इस अदालत में अनश्वतन या वकालतन वह अन्यथा अदम हावरी में कार्यवाही एक-तरफा अमल में लाई जायेगी ।

आज दिनांक 11-6-2001 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ ।

मोहर ।

डी० आर० वर्मा,  
महायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,  
नाहन, जिला शिरमोर,  
हिमाचल प्रदेश ।

व अदालत डा० एम० पी० सूद, उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी, पांवटा साहिव, जिला सिरमोर (हि० प्र०) ।

श्री राय सिंह पुत्र बलबीर, गांव भारापुर, तहसील पांवटा, जिला सिरमोर (हि० प्र०) ।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्री राय सिंह पुत्र बलबीर, गांव भारापुर, तहसील पांवटा ने इस अदालत में एक प्रार्थना-पत्र गुजारा है कि उसका स्वयं का जन्म दिनांक 15-4-1967 को हुआ था परन्तु अज्ञानतावश उसकी जन्म तिथि ग्राम पंचायत धीलाकुआ के रिकार्ड में 1967 दज की गई है जो गलत है ।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इश्तहार के माफत सूचित किया जाता है कि इस बारे किसी को कोई उजर/एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 2-8-2001 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे अदालत हजा रित्यनाहन में असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर आकर दर्ज करा सकता है । निर्धारित अवधि के पश्चात कोई आपत्ति प्राप्त न होने की सूत्र में प्रार्थना-पत्र श्री राय सिंह पर नियमानुसार कार्यवाही की जाएगी ।

आज दिनांक 3-7-2001 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व कार्यालय मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया ।

मोहर ।

एम० पी० सूद,  
उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी, पांवटा साहिव,  
जिला सिरमोर, हिमाचल प्रदेश ।

ब अदालत डा० एम० पी० सूद, उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी पांवटा साहिब, जिला सिरमोर, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्री प्रमोद कुमार पुत्र श्री धनी राम, गांव व्यास, तहसील पांवटा, जिला सिरमोर, हिमाचल प्रदेश ।

ब अदालत डा० एम० पी० सूद, उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी, पांवटा साहिब, जिला सिरमोर, हिमाचल प्रदेश

वनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्री प्रमोद कुमार पुत्र श्री धनी राम, निवासी गाम व्यास, तहसील पांवटा ने इस अदालत में एक प्रार्थना-पत्र गुजारा है कि उसकी लड़की नाम दिव्या का जन्म दिनांक 1-7-1997 को हुआ था परन्तु अज्ञानता-वश वह उसकी जन्म तिथि ग्राम पंचायत व्यास के रिकाई में दर्ज नहीं करा गया है ।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इश्तहार के मार्फत सूचित किया जाता है कि इन बारे किसी को कोई उत्तर व एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 2-8-2001 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे अदालत हुजा स्थित पांवटा में अमानन या बकालतन हाजिर आकर दर्ज करा रक्ता है । निर्धारित अवधि के पश्चात् कोई आपत्ति प्राप्त न होने की सूरत में प्रार्थना-पत्र श्री प्रमोद कुमार पर नियमानुसार कार्यवाही की जाएगी ।

आज दिनांक 3-7-2001 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया ।

मोहर ।

एम० पी० सूद,  
उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी, पांवटा साहिब,  
जिला सिरमोर, हिमाचल प्रदेश ।

ब अदालत डा० एम० पी० सूद, उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी  
पांवटा साहिब, जिला सिरमोर (हि० प्र०)

श्री छोटा राम पुत्र ज्ञापी राम, निवासी सतीवाला, तहसील शिनाहि, जिला सिरमोर (हि० प्र०) ।

वनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्री छोटा राम पुत्र ज्ञापी राम ने इस अदालत में एक प्रार्थना-पत्र दिया है कि उसका नाम छोटा राम है परन्तु पंचायत रिकाई ग्राम पंचायत सतीवाला में उसका नाम रोड़ा राम किया गया है जोकि गलत है ।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इश्तहार के मार्फत सूचित किया जाता है कि इन बारे किसी व्यक्ति को कोई एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 2-8-2001 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे अदालत हुजा स्थित पांवटा में पावडा नाहिव में असालतन अथवा बकालतन हाजिर आकर अपनी स्थिति/एतराज प्रस्तुत कर मकात है । निर्धारित तिथि पर कोई एतराज प्राप्त न होने को सूरत में प्रार्थना-पत्र श्री छोटा राम पर नियमानुसार कार्यवाही की जाएगी ।

आज दिनांक 3-7-2001 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व कार्यालय मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया ।

मोहर ।

एम० पी० सूद,  
उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी, पांवटा साहिब,  
जिला सिरमोर (हि० प्र०) ।

वनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्री नवीन कुमार पुत्र राम सरन, निवासी पांवटा, तहसील पांवटा, जिला सिरमोर, हिमाचल प्रदेश ।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इश्तहार के मार्फत सूचित किया जाता है कि इस बारे किसी को कोई उत्तर/एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 7-8-2001 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे अदालत हुजा स्थित पांवटा में असालतन या बकालतन हाजिर आकर दर्ज करा सकता है । निर्धारित अवधि के पश्चात् कोई आपत्ति प्राप्त न होने की सूरत में प्रार्थना-पत्र श्री नवीन कुमार पर नियमानुसार कार्यवाही की जाएगी ।

आज दिनांक 7-6-2001 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व कार्यालय मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया ।

मोहर ।

एम० पी० सूद  
उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी,  
पांवटा साहिब, जिला सिरमोर,  
हिमाचल प्रदेश ।

ब अदालत श्री एस० पी० रोल्टा, उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी, राजगढ़, जिला सिरमोर, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्री नरेश कुमार पुत्र श्री रत्ती राम, निवासी रेडी गुसान, बस्ती तहसील राजगढ़, जिला सिरमोर, हिमाचल प्रदेश ।

वनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्री नरेश कुमार पुत्र श्री रत्ती राम, निवासी रेडी गुसान, तहसील राजगढ़, जिला सिरमोर (हि० प्र०) ने इस अदालत का जन्म तिथि 10-3-1996 को हुआ है । जिसका नाम ग्राम पंचायत ठोड़ा तहसील राजगढ़ में दर्ज नहीं हुआ है ।

अतः इस अदालती इश्तहार द्वारा सर्वसाधारण जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि उक्त नाम व तिथि पंचायत रिकाई में दर्जे करने वारे किसी को कोई एतराज हो तो वह तिथि 30-7-2001 को या इससे पूर्व हाजिर होकर अपना एतराज पेश कर सकता है अन्यथा पंचायत सचिव को समन्वित उक्त नाम व जन्म तिथि दर्जे करने वारा गोदान जारी कर दिए जाएंगे ।

मोहर ।

एस० पी० रोल्टा  
उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी, राजगढ़,  
जिला सिरमोर (हि० प्र०) ।

व अदालत श्री एस० पी० रोल्टा, उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी, राजगढ़, जिला सिरमोर, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्री मन बहादुर पुत्र बल बहादुर, निवासी खेडाधार, तहसील राजगढ़, जिला सिरमोर, हिमाचल प्रदेश ।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

प्रस्तवान्न जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु रजिस्ट्रीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्री मन बहादुर पुत्र श्री बल बहादुर, निवासी ग्राम खेडाधार, ग्राम पंचायत भूरीरा, तहसील राजगढ़, जिला सिरमोर, हिमाचल प्रदेश ने इस कार्यालय में अर्जी पेश की है कि उसकी अपनी मनवहादुर की जन्म तिथि 20-3-1961 की है। जिसका नाम ग्राम पंचायत भूरीरा, तहसील राजगढ़ में दर्ज नहीं हुआ है।

अतः इस प्रदालती इस्तहार द्वारा मर्वसाधारण जनता को सूचित किया जाना है कि यदि उक्त नाम व तिथि पंचायत रिकार्ड/एन० ५० सी० रिकार्ड में दर्ज करने वारे किसी को कोई एतराज हो तो वह तिथि 30-07-2001 को या इससे पूर्व हाजिर होकर अपना एतराज पेश कर सकता है। अन्यथा पंचायत सचिव को सम्बन्धित उक्त नाम व जन्म तिथि दर्ज करने वारा आदेश जारी कर दिए जाएंगे।

मोहर।

एस० पी० रोल्टा,  
उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी,  
राजगढ़, जिला सिरमोर (हि० प्र०)।

व अदालत श्री एस० पी० रोल्टा, उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी राजगढ़, जिला सिरमोर, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्री हुकम सिंह पुत्र लच्छी राम, निवासी धाईला देवठी, तहसील राजगढ़, जिला सिरमोर, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

प्रस्तवान्न जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु रजिस्ट्रीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्री हुकम सिंह पुत्र श्री लच्छी राम, निवासी ग्राम धाईला देवठी, तहसील राजगढ़, जिला सिरमोर, हिमाचल प्रदेश ने इस कार्यालय में जुजारिया पेश की है कि उसकी पुत्री कुमारी सुलेखा का जन्म तिथि 10-10-1994 को हुआ है जिसका नाम ग्राम पंचायत धाईला देवठी, तहसील राजगढ़ में दर्ज नहीं हुआ है।

अतः इस प्रदालती इस्तहार द्वारा सर्व साधारण जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि उक्त नाम व तिथि पंचायत रिकार्ड/एन० ५० सी० रिकार्ड में दर्ज करने वारे किसी को कोई एतराज हो तो वह तिथि 30-7-2001 को या इससे पूर्व हाजिर होकर अपना एतराज पेश कर सकता है। अन्यथा पंचायत सचिव को सम्बन्धित उक्त नाम व जन्म तिथियां दर्ज करने वारा आदेश जारी कर दिए जायेंगे।

मोहर।

एस० पी० रोल्टा,  
उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी,  
राजगढ़, जिला सिरमोर (हि० प्र०)।

व अदालत श्री एस० पी० रोल्टा, उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी, राजगढ़, जिला सिरमोर (हि० प्र०)

श्री अमर सिंह पुत्र कालटू, निवासी ग्राम अनोग, तहसील राजगढ़, जिला सिरमोर, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

प्रस्तवान्न जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु रजिस्ट्रीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्री अमर सिंह पुत्र श्री कालटू, निवासी ग्राम अनोग, तहसील राजगढ़, जिला सिरमोर, हिमाचल प्रदेश ने इस कार्यालय में गुजारिया पेश की है कि उसकी पुत्री कुमारी पूजा देवी का जन्म तिथि 11-7-1995 को हुआ है। जिसका नाम ग्राम पंचायत डिन्बर, तहसील राजगढ़ में दर्ज नहीं हुआ है।

अतः इस प्रदालती इस्तहार द्वारा सर्व साधारण जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि उक्त नाम व तिथि पंचायत रिकार्ड/एन० ५० सी० रिकार्ड में दर्ज करने वारे किसी को कोई एतराज हो तो वह तिथि 30-07-2001 को या इससे पूर्व हाजिर होकर अपना एतराज पेश कर सकता है। अन्यथा पंचायत सचिव को सम्बन्धित उक्त नाम व जन्म तिथि दर्ज करने वारा आदेश जारी कर दिए जाएंगे।

मोहर।

एस० पी० रोल्टा,  
उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी,  
राजगढ़, जिला सिरमोर (हि० प्र०)।

व अदालत श्री एस० पी० रोल्टा, उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी, राजगढ़, जिला सिरमोर, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्री बलबन्त सिंह पुत्र श्री गंगा राम, निवासी ग्राम भाटकास्याता, तहसील राजगढ़, जिला सिरमोर, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

प्रस्तवान्न जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु रजिस्ट्रीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्री बलबन्त सिंह पुत्र श्री गंगा राम, निवासी ग्राम भाटकास्याता, तहसील राजगढ़, जिला सिरमोर, हिमाचल प्रदेश की है कि उसकी-जुजायां कुमारी प्रती कुमारा दामनी की जन्म तिथियां 24-09-96 व 26-06-98 को हुआ है। जिसका नाम ग्राम पंचायत भूरीरा, तहसील राजगढ़ में दर्ज नहीं हुआ है।

अतः इस प्रदालती इस्तहार द्वारा सर्व साधारण जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि उक्त नाम व तिथियां पंचायत रिकार्ड/एन० ५० सी० रिकार्ड में दर्ज करने वारे किसी को कोई एतराज हो तो वह तिथि 30-07-2001 को या इससे पूर्व हाजिर होकर अपना एतराज पेश कर सकता है। अन्यथा पंचायत सचिव को सम्बन्धित उक्त नाम व जन्म तिथियां दर्ज करने वारा आदेश जारी कर दिए जायेंगे।

मोहर।

एस० पी० रोल्टा,  
उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी,  
राजगढ़, जिला सिरमोर (हि० प्र०)।

व अदालत श्री एस० पी० रोल्टा, उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी, राजगढ़, जिला सिरमोर, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्री विवेक शर्मा पुत्र श्री रामा नन्द, निवासी मटनाली, तहसील राजगढ़, जिला सिरमोर, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

प्रस्तवान्न जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु रजिस्ट्रीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्री विवेक शर्मा पुत्र श्री रामा नन्द, निवासी ग्राम मटनाली, तहसील राजगढ़, जिला सिरमोर, हिमाचल प्रदेश की है कि उसकी पुत्री विवेक शर्मा का जन्म तिथि 25-1-1998 को हुआ है जिसका नाम ग्राम पंचायत सेर जगास तहसील राजगढ़ में दर्ज नहीं हुआ है।

अतः इस अदालती इश्तहार द्वारा सर्वसाधारण जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि उक्त नाम व तिथि पंचायत रिकार्ड/एन००५०३०० रिकार्ड में दर्ज करने वारे किसी को कोई एतराज हो तो वह तिथि 30-7-2001 को या इससे पूर्व हाजिर होकर अपना एतराज पेश कर सकता है। अन्यथा पंचायत सचिव को सम्बन्धित उक्त नाम व जन्म तिथि दर्ज करने वारा आदेश जारी कर दिए जाएंगे।

मोहर।

एस० पी० रोल्टा,  
उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी,  
राजगढ़, जिला सिरमोर (हि० प्र०)।

ब अदालत श्री एस० पी० रोल्टा, उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी, राजगढ़, जिला सिरमोर, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्री आत्मा राम पुत्र श्री जमनु राम, निवासी शाया-सनीरा, तहसील राजगढ़, जिला सिरमोर, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

बनाम

आम जनता

दरखास्त जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु रजिस्ट्रीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्री आत्मा राम पुत्र श्री जमनु राम, निवासी ग्राम शाया-सनीरा, तहसील राजगढ़, जिला सिरमोर, हिमाचल प्रदेश ने इस कार्यालय में गुजारिश पेश की है कि उसकी पुत्री कुमारी अर्जु का जन्म तिथि 20-0-2-1996 को हुआ है जिसका नाम ग्राम पंचायत शाया-सनीरा, तहसील राजगढ़ में दर्ज नहीं हुआ।

अतः इस अदालती इश्तहार द्वारा सर्वसाधारण जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि उक्त नाम व तिथि पंचायत रिकार्ड/एन००५०३०० में दर्ज करने वारे किसी को कोई एतराज हो तो वह तिथि 30-7-2001 को या इससे पूर्व हाजिर होकर अपना एतराज पेश कर सकता है। अन्यथा सम्बन्धित पंचायत सचिव को सम्बन्धित उक्त नाम व जन्म तिथि दर्ज करने वारा आदेश जारी कर दिए जाएंगे।

मोहर।

एस० पी० रोल्टा,  
उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी,  
राजगढ़, जिला सिरमोर (हि० प्र०)।

ब अदालत श्री एस० पी० रोल्टा, उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी, राजगढ़, जिला सिरमोर, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्रीमती मुनीता पुत्री श्री किरण, निवासी ग्राम जमलोग, डाकधर वासनी, तहसील पच्छाद, जिला सिरमोर, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

बनाम

आम जनता

दरखास्त जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु रजिस्ट्रीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्रीमती मुनीता पुत्री श्री किरण, निवासी ग्राम जमलोग, तहसील पच्छाद, जिला सिरमोर, हिमाचल प्रदेश ने इस कार्यालय में गुजारिश पेश की है कि उसकी पुत्री कुमारी पूनम का जन्म तिथि 07-0-7-1998 को हुआ है जिसका नाम ग्राम पंचायत वासनी, तहसील पच्छाद में दर्ज नहीं हुआ।

अतः इस अदालती इश्तहार द्वारा सर्वसाधारण जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि उक्त नाम व तिथि पंचायत रिकार्ड/एन००५०३०० में दर्ज करने वारे किसी को कोई एतराज हो तो वह तिथि 30-7-2001 को या इससे पूर्व हाजिर होकर अपना एतराज पेश कर सकता है। अन्यथा पंचायत सचिव को सम्बन्धित उक्त नाम व जन्म तिथि दर्ज करने वारा आदेश जारी कर दिए जाएंगे।

मोहर।

एस० पी० रोल्टा,

ब अदालत श्री एस० पी० रोल्टा, उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी, राजगढ़, जिला सिरमोर, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्री नन्द लाल पुत्र पुन्न राम, निवासी पलाशना, तहसील राजगढ़, जिला सिरमोर, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

बनाम

आम जनता

दरखास्त जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु रजिस्ट्रीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्री नन्द लाल पुत्र पुन्न राम, निवासी ग्राम पलाशना, तहसील राजगढ़, जिला सिरमोर, हिमाचल प्रदेश ने इस कार्यालय में अर्जी पेश की है कि उसकी पुत्रियां कुमारी पूजा व कुमारी रंजना की जन्म तिथियां 2-1-1999 व 31-3-2001 को हुआ हैं। जिसका नाम ग्राम पंचायत करगाण, तहसील राजगढ़ में दर्ज नहीं हुआ है।

अतः इस अदालती इश्तहार द्वारा सर्वसाधारण जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि उक्त नाम व तिथि पंचायत रिकार्ड/एन००५०३०० में दर्ज करने वारे किसी को कोई एतराज हो तो वह तिथि 30-7-2001 को या इससे पूर्व हाजिर होकर अपना एतराज पेश कर सकता है। अन्यथा पंचायत सचिव को सम्बन्धित उक्त नाम व जन्म तिथि दर्ज करने वारा आदेश जारी कर दिए जाएंगे।

मोहर।

एस० पी० रोल्टा,  
उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी, राजगढ़,  
जिला सिरमोर (हि० प्र०)।

ब अदालत श्री एस० पी० रोल्टा, उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी, राजगढ़, जिला सिरमोर, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्रीमती चम्पा देवी पत्नी स्व० चतर रिंह, निवासी चतकाना, तहसील पच्छाद, जिला सिरमोर, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

बनाम

आम जनता

दरखास्त जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु रजिस्ट्रीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्रीमती चम्पा देवी पत्नी स्व० चतर रिंह, निवासी ग्राम चतकाना, तहसील पच्छाद, जिला सिरमोर, हिमाचल प्रदेश ने इस कार्यालय में गुजारिश की है कि उसके पीत्र मुनीत कुमार का जन्म दिनांक 3-1-96 को हुआ है। जिसका नाम ग्राम पंचायत बजगा, तहसील पच्छाद में दर्ज नहीं हुआ है।

अतः इस अदालती इश्तहार द्वारा सर्वसाधारण जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि उक्त नाम व तिथि पंचायत रिकार्ड/एन००५०३०० में दर्ज करने वारे किसी को कोई एतराज हो तो वह तिथि 6-8-2001 को या इससे पूर्व हाजिर होकर अपना एतराज पेश कर सकता है। अन्यथा पंचायत सचिव को सम्बन्धित उक्त नाम व जन्म तिथि दर्ज करने वारा आदेश जारी कर दिए जाएंगे।

मोहर।

एस० पी० रोल्टा,  
उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी, राजगढ़,  
जिला सिरमोर, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

ब अदालत श्री एस० पी० रोल्टा, उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी, राजगढ़, जिला सिरमोर, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्री गुरुमुख राम पुत्र मनशा गम, निवासी काहन, तहसील पच्छाद, जिला सिरमोर, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

बनाम

प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्री गुरुमुख राम पुत्र मनशा राम, निवासी ग्राम काहन, तहसील पच्छाद, जिला सिरमोर, हिमाचल प्रदेश ने इस कार्यालय में गुजारिश पेश की है कि उसकी अपनी गुरुमुख राम का जन्म तिथि 17-10-1960 को हुआ है। जिसका नाम ग्राम पंचायत बनाहा धिनी, तहसील पच्छाद में दर्ज नहीं हुआ है।

अतः इस अदालती इक्षत्तहार द्वारा सर्वसाधारण जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि उक्त नाम व तिथि पंचायत रिकार्ड में दर्ज करने वारे किसी को कोई एतराज हो तो वह तिथि 6-8-2001 को या इससे पूर्व हाजिर होकर अपना एतराज पेश कर सकता है। अन्यथा पंचायत सचिव को सम्बन्धित उक्त नाम व जन्म तिथि दर्ज करने वारा आदेश जारी कर दिए जाएंगे।

मोहर।

एस० पी० रोल्टा,  
उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी,  
राजगढ़, जिला सिरमोर, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

व अदालत श्री अरुण भारद्वाज, कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, कण्डाधाट  
जिला सोलन, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्री कादर बब्श सुपुत्र श्री गफूर, निवासी ग्राम सलाणा, तहसील कण्डाधाट, जिला सोलन, हिमाचल प्रदेश

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 के अन्तर्गत जन्म तिथि दर्ज करने वारे।

जैसा कि कादर बब्श सुपुत्र श्री गफूर, निवासी ग्राम सलाणा, तहसील कण्डाधाट, जिला सोलन (हि० प्र०) ने आवेदन किया है कि उसका जन्म दिनांक 8-5-1949 को हुआ है किन्तु ग्राम पंचायत अधिकारी व मृत्यु चिकित्सा अधिकारी, सोलन को रिपोर्ट हेतु भेजा गया। चिकित्सा अधिकारी, सोलन ने प्रार्थी की जांच के उपरान्त उसकी आयु 53 वर्ष बताई है। अतः मुख्य चिकित्सा अधिकारी की रिपोर्ट के आधार पर प्रार्थी की आयु का निर्धारण 8-5-1948 किया जाता है।

अतः इस इक्षत्तहार द्वारा सर्वसाधारण एवं ग्राम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि इस बारे किसी व्यक्ति को कोई एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 6-8-2001 को या इससे पूर्व प्रातः 1.00 बजे इस अदालत में असालतन या बकालतन हाजिर आकर अपना एतराज प्रस्तुत करें बाद गुजाने सियाद एतराज की समायत न होगी तथा कादर बब्श सुपुत्र श्री गफूर, निवासी ग्राम सलाणा, तहसील कण्डाधाट की जन्म तिथि 8-5-1948 के पंजीकरण सम्बन्धित आदेश सम्बन्धित पंचायत के रजिस्ट्रार जन्म एवं मृत्यु को दर्ज करने वारे परित कर दिये जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 26-6-2001 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

अरुण भारद्वाज,  
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, कण्डाधाट,  
जिला सोलन, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

व अदालत श्री प्रवीण कुमार टाक, कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, कसौली  
जिला सोलन, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

मुकद्दमा :

श्री श्याम सिंह सुपुत्र श्री गोकुल सिंह, निवासी एम० ई० एस० कलौनी, कसौली

प्रार्थी।

ग्राम जनता

प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम 1969

नोटिस बनाम ग्राम जनता।

श्री श्याम सिंह सुपुत्र श्री गोकुल सिंह, निवासी एम० ई० एस० कलौनी, कसौली, तहसील कसौली ने इस न्यावालय में प्रार्थना-पत्र पेश किया है कि मेरे सुपुत्र धन बहादुर का जन्म 6-8-1995 को मेरे क्वाटर एम० ई० एस० कलौनी, कसौली में हुआ था किसी कारणवश छावनी मण्डल के कार्यालय में दर्ज न करवा सका। अब दर्ज करवाना चाहता है।

अतः इस नोटिस द्वारा वर्व गावारण जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को इस जन्म तिथि के दर्ज करने वारे कोई एतराज हो तो वह असालतन या बकालतन दिनांक 6-8-2001 को हाजिर होकर पेश कर सकता है। अन्यथा सम्बन्धित कार्यालय को जन्म तिथि दर्ज करने के आदेश दे दिए जायेंगे।

आज दिनांक 21-6-2001 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

प्रवीण कुमार टाक,  
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, कसौली,  
जिला सोलन (हि० प्र०)।

व अदालत श्री नरेन्द्र शर्मा, उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी (ना०), अम्ब  
जिला ऊना, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

श्री हरदीप सिंह राणा पुत्र श्री शेर सिंह, निवासी रामपुर मरवाड़ी, तहसील अम्ब, जिला ऊना, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969।

श्री हरदीप सिंह राणा पुत्र श्री शेर सिंह, निवासी रामपुर मरवाड़ी, ने इस अदालत में एक प्रार्थना-पत्र गुजारा है कि उसके लड़के का नाम शेर राणा पुत्र श्री हरदीप सिंह राणा का जन्म दिनांक 30-7-1990 को हुआ था परन्तु अज्ञानातावश वह उसकी जन्म तिथि ग्राम पंचायत मरवाड़ी के रिकार्ड में दर्ज नहीं करा सका है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इक्षत्तहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि इस बारे किसी कोई उजर/एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 31-7-2001 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे अदालत हजा लित अम्ब में असालतन या बकालतन हाजिर आकर अपना एतराज दर्ज करा सकता है निर्धारित अवधि के पश्चात कोई आपत्ति प्राप्त न होने की सुरत में प्रार्थना-पत्र श्री हरदीप सिंह राणा पर नियमानुसार कार्यवाही की जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 27-6-2001 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

नरेन्द्र शर्मा,  
उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी,  
अम्ब, जिला ऊना, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

व अदालत श्री नरेन्द्र शर्मा, उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी (ना०), अम्ब  
जिला ऊना, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

श्रीमती मीना देवी पल्ली श्री राकेश कुमार, निवासी लोहारली, तहसील अम्ब, जिला ऊना, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण

श्रीमती मीना देवी पत्नी श्री राकेश कुमार, निवासी लौहारली ने इस अदालत में एक प्रार्थना-पत्र गुजारा है कि उसके लिंग का नाम अनुश ठाकुर पुत्र श्री राकेश कुमार का जन्म दिनांक 21-11-1996 को हुआ था परन्तु अज्ञानतावश वह उसकी जन्म तिथि ग्राम पंचायत लौहारली के रिकांड में दर्ज नहीं करा सका है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इष्टहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि इस बारे किसी को कोई उत्तर/एतराज हो तो वह विनांक 31-7-2001 को प्राप्त: 10.00 बजे अदालत हजा स्थित अम्ब में असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर आकर अपना एतराज दर्ज करा सकता है। निर्धारित अवधि के पश्चात् कोई आपत्ति प्राप्त न होने की सूत्र में प्रार्थना-पत्र श्रीमती मीना देवी पर नियमानुसार कार्यवाही की जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 27-6-2001 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

नरेन्द्र शर्मा,  
उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी (ना०),  
अम्ब, जिला ऊना, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

व अदालत श्री नरेन्द्र शर्मा, उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी (ना०), अम्ब  
तहसील अम्ब, जिला ऊना, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

श्री सुरेन्द्र कुमार पुत्र श्री प्रकाश चन्द, निवासी सूरी, तहसील अम्ब,  
जिला ऊना, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण  
मधिनियम 1969.

श्री सुरेन्द्र कुमार पुत्र श्री प्रकाश चन्द, निवासी सूरी ने इस अदालत में एक प्रार्थना-पत्र गुजारा है कि उसके लिंग का नाम सुरेन्द्र कुमार का जन्म दिनांक 9-5-1998 को हुआ था परन्तु अज्ञानतावश वह उसकी जन्म तिथि ग्राम पंचायत सूरी के रिकांड में दर्ज नहीं करा सका है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इष्टहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि इस बारे किसी को कोई उत्तर/एतराज हो तो वह विनांक 31-7-2001 को प्राप्त: 10.00 बजे अदालत हजा स्थित अम्ब में असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर आकर अपना एतराज दर्ज करा सकता है। निर्धारित अवधि के पश्चात् कोई आपत्ति प्राप्त न होने की सूत्र में प्रार्थना-पत्र श्रीमता पूनम रानी पर नियमानुसार कार्यवाही की जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 27-6-2001 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

नरेन्द्र शर्मा,  
उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी (ना०),  
अम्ब, तहसील अम्ब, जिला ऊना, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

व अदालत श्री नरेन्द्र शर्मा, उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी (ना०), अम्ब  
तहसील अम्ब, जिला ऊना, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

श्रीमती पूनम रानी पत्नी श्री विमल कुमार, निवासी मरवाड़ी,  
तहसील अम्ब, जिला ऊना, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण मधिनियम, 1969.

श्रीमती पूनम कुमारी पत्नी श्री विमल कुमार, निवासी मरवाड़ी ने इस अदालत में एक प्रार्थना-पत्र गुजारा है कि उसके पुत्र रजत कुमार पुत्र श्री विमल कुमार का जन्म दिनांक 22-10-1996 को हुआ था परन्तु अज्ञानतावश वह उसकी जन्म तिथि ग्राम पंचायत मरवाड़ी के रिकांड में दर्ज नहीं करा सका है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इष्टहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि इस बारे किसी को कोई उत्तर/एतराज हो तो वह विनांक 31-7-2001 को प्राप्त: 10.00 बजे अदालत हजा स्थित अम्ब में असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर आकर अपना एतराज करा सकता है। निर्धारित अवधि के पश्चात् कोई आपत्ति प्राप्त न होने की सूत्र में प्रार्थना-पत्र श्रीमती पूनम रानी पर नियमानुसार कार्यवाही की जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 27-6-2001 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

नरेन्द्र शर्मा,  
उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी (ना०),  
अम्ब, तहसील अम्ब, जिला ऊना, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

व अदालत श्री नरेन्द्र शर्मा, उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी (ना०), अम्ब  
तहसील अम्ब, जिला ऊना, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

श्री सनदेश कुमार पुत्र श्री दुर्गा दास, निवासी गगरेट, तहसील अम्ब,  
जिला ऊना (हि० प्र०) ने इस कार्यालय में एक दरखतात्मक गुजारा है कि उसके पुत्र का नाम नगर पंचायत रिकांड में कृष्ण धीमान लिखा गया है जो कि गलत है जबकि उसका नाम कृष्ण धीमान की जगह केशव धीमान दर्ज किया जावे।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इष्टहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी भी व्यक्ति को श्री सनदेश कुमार के पुत्र के नाम दस्ती बारे कोई एतराज हो तो वह विनांक 31-7-2001 को असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर आकर अपना एतराज पेश करा सकता है न आगे की सूत्र में एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाकर नाम दस्ती बारे आदेश जारी कर दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 27-6-2001 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

नरेन्द्र शर्मा,  
उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी (ना०), अम्ब,  
तहसील अम्ब, जिला ऊना, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

व अदालत नामब-तहसीलदार एवं कार्यालयी दण्डाधिकारी, ऊना  
तहसील व जिला ऊना (हि० प्र०)

मुकद्दमा: मृत्यु तिथि प्रमाण-पत्र।

बहुमा नन्द

बनाम

आम जनता खड़

बरखात्मक जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण मधिनियम, 1969.

नाटिस बनाम आम जनता।

श्री भजन दास पुत्र श्री मंगल राम, निवासी गांव खड्क, तहसील व जिला ऊना ने इस न्यायालय में दरखास्त मूल्यार्थी है कि उसकी पुत्री तारा वेंवी घट्टी जयिन्द्र पाल की मृत्यु किसी कारणवश ग्राव पचायत रजिस्टर में दर्ज न करवाई जा सकी है जोकि अब दर्ज करवाई जाये। प्रार्थी ने मृतक की मृत्यु तिथि 7-7-1985 बताई है तथा नाम मृत्यु स्थान खड्क बताया है।

मत: इस नोटिस के माध्यम से समस्त जनता तथा सम्बन्धी रिसेप्टेवरों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को उस भूमिका की मृत्यु तिथि दर्ज करवाने वारे कोई आपत्ति एवं उत्तर दी जा वह दिनांक 3-8-2001 को प्राप्त: दस बजे असालतन या बकालतन हाजिर अदालत आकर पेश करें अन्यथा एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाकर प्रार्थी द्वारा बताई गई मृत्यु तिथि दर्ज करने के निवेश जारी कर दिये जाएंगे तथा बाद में कोई भी उत्तर बालंगल समायत न होगा।

आज दिनांक 27-6-2001 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/-  
नायब-तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,  
ऊना, तहसील व जिला ऊना, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

व अदालत नायब-तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, ऊना तहसील व जिला ऊना, हिमाचल प्रदेश

मुकदमा: जन्म तिथि प्रमाण-पत्र।

भजन दास बनाम आम जनता नंगल सलांगड़ी

दरखास्त जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म व मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

नोटिस बनाम आम जनता।

श्री भजन दास पुत्र श्री धनीराम, निवासी गांव नंगल सलांगड़ी, तहसील व जिला ऊना ने इस न्यायालय में दरखास्त दी है कि उसके पत्र सुरक्ष कुमार कटनोरिका का नाम पचायत रजिस्टर में गलती से दर्ज न करवाया जा सका है और अब दर्ज करवाया जाये। उसके पत्र की जन्म तिथि 25-6-1995 है तथा बच्चे का जन्म स्थान गांव नंगल सलांगड़ी है।

मत: इस नोटिस के माध्यम से समस्त जनता तथा सम्बन्धित रिसेप्टेवरों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को उसका नाम दर्ज करवाने वारे कोई उत्तर/आपत्ति हो तो वह दिनांक 3-8-2001 को प्राप्त: दस बजे स्वयं अभ्यासालतन या बकालतन इस अदालत में हाजिर आकर पेश करें अन्यथा एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाकर प्रमाण-पत्र जारी करने के निवेश दे दिये जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 4-7-2001 को हस्ताक्षर हमारे व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/-  
नायब-तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,  
ऊना, तहसील व जिला ऊना (हि० प्र०)।

व अदालत नायब-तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, ऊना तहसील व जिला ऊना (हि० प्र०)

मुकदमा: जन्म तिथि प्रमाण-पत्र।

भजन दास बनाम आम जनता नंगल सलांगड़ी

दरखास्त जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

नोटिस बनाम आम जनता।

श्री भजन दास पुत्र श्री धनीराम, निवासी गांव नंगल सलांगड़ी, तहसील व जिला ऊना ने इस न्यायालय में दरखास्त दी है कि उसकी पुत्री सिमरन कोर का नाम व जन्म पंचायत रजिस्टर में गलती से दर्ज न करवाया जा सका है और अब दर्ज करवाया जाये। इसकी पुत्री की जन्म तिथि 25-6-1996 है तथा बच्चे का जन्म गांव नंगल सलांगड़ी में हुआ है।

बत: इस नोटिस के माध्यम से समस्त जनता तथा सम्बन्धी रिसेप्टेवरों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को उपरोक्त नाम व जन्म तिथि दर्ज होने में कोई उत्तर/एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 4-8-2001 को प्राप्त: 10.00 बजे स्वयं अभ्यासालतन या बकालतन इस अदालत में हाजिर आकर पेश करें अन्यथा एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाकर प्रमाण-पत्र जारी करने के निवेश दे दिये जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 4-7-2001 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/-  
नायब-तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,  
ऊना, तहसील व जिला ऊना (हि० प्र०)।

व अदालत श्री एस० के० पराशर, तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी ऊना, तहसील व जिला ऊना, हिमाचल प्रदेश

मुकदमा: जन्म तिथि प्रमाण-पत्र।

मूल रजि

बनाम

आम जनता जलग्रां।

दरखास्त जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

नोटिस बनाम आम जनता।

श्री मूल राज पुत्र श्री देस राज, निवासी गांव जलग्रां तहसील व जिला ऊना, हिमाचल प्रदेश ने इस न्यायालय में एक दरखास्त दी है कि उसकी पुत्री कुमारी शिल्पा का नाम व जन्म पंचायत रजिस्टर में गलती से दर्ज न करवाया जा सका है और अब दर्ज करवाया जाये। उसकी पुत्री की जन्म तिथि 20-6-1996 है तथा बच्ची का जन्म स्थान गांव जलग्रां है।

बत: इस नोटिस के माध्यम से समस्त जनता तथा सम्बन्धित रिसेप्टेवरों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को उपरोक्त नाम व जन्म तिथि दर्ज होने में कोई उत्तर या एतराज हो तो वह इस नोटिस के प्रकाशन होने के पश्चात् एक माह के अन्दर-महंदर अभ्यासालतन या बकालतन इस अदालत में हाजिर आकर पेश करें अन्यथा एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाकर प्रमाण-पत्र जारी करने के निवेश सम्बन्धित कार्यालय को दे दिये जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 23-6-2001 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

एस० के० पराशर,  
तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,  
ऊना, तहसील व जिला ऊना, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

व अदालत नायब-तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, ऊना तहसील व जिला ऊना, हिमाचल प्रदेश

मुकदमा:—जन्म तिथि प्रमाण-पत्र।

जोगिन्द्र सिंह

बनाम

आम जनता संसोट।

दरखास्त जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

नोटिस बनाम आम जनता।

